Bequest of

Rev. H. C. Scadding, D.D.

to the Library

of the

University of Toronto

1901

HANDBOUND
AT THE

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

https://archive.org/details/classicaljournal15londuoft

(24) 6796

THE

CLASSICAL JOURNAL:

FOR

MARCH AND JUNE, 1817.

COL.COLL.
LIBRARY.
N.YORK.

VOL. XV.

Ὦ φίλος, εἰ σοφὸς εἶ, λάβε μ' ἐς χέρας· εἰ δέ γε πάμπαν
Νήϊς ἔφυς Μουσέων, ῥίψον ἃ μὴ νοέεις.

EPIG. INCERT.

London:

PRINTED BY A. J. VALPY,

TOOKE'S COURT, CHANCERY LANE;

SOLD BY

LONGMAN, HURST, REES, ORME, AND BROWN; RIVINGTONS; SHERWOOD, NEELY, AND JONES, PATERNOSTER ROW; UNDERWOOD, FLEET-STREET; PARKER, OXFORD; BARRET, CAMBRIDGE; MACREDIE AND CO., EDINBURGH; AND ALL OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

1817.

13100

CONTENTS OF NO. XXIX.

PAGE

ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΦΟΙΝΙΚΟΣ. Part II. 1

Collatio Codicis Harleiani 5674. cum Odyssea Editionis Ernestinæ 1760. (No. VIII.) 14

Desultory Remarks on Juvenal 18

Observations on Dr. Maltby's Edition of Morell's Thesaurus Prosodiacus. Part II. 27

De Græcis Novi Testamenti Accentibus 39

C. A. Klotzii Libellus de Felici Audacia Horatii. No. II. 61

Notice of Godofredi Hermanni Elementa Doctrinæ Metricæ .. 79

Cambridge Tripos for 1789 83

Latin Poem 86

Remarks on the Similarity of Worship, that prevailed in different parts of the Pagan World. Part III. 88

On the Cæsura 95

On the Sapphic and Alcaic Metres. Part II. 105

On a Passage of Livy 115

Notice of Ouvaroff on the Eleusinian Mysteries. No. III. 117

11988

PAGE

Some Observations on the Worship of Vesta, and the Holy Fire, in Ancient Rome: with an Account of the Vestal Virgins. By Dr. G. H. NOEHDEN. Part I. 123

ADVERSARIA LITERARIA. No. XI.—Julii Phædri Fabulæ Novæ. Pars II. 131

Dr. Crombie's Remarks on the Notice of his "Gymnasium, sive Symbola Critica" 145

Loci quidam Luciani emendati atque explanati à JOANNE SEAGER, A. B. Pars V. 151

Notice of Sir W. Gell's Itinerary of the Morea 156

Sappho Emendata 157

Prologus in Eunuchum, Fabulam ab Alumn. Reg. Schol. Westm. actam, A. D. 1816. 158

Epilogus Do. 159

Additional Remarks relating to the Discovery of the Inscription upon the Column of Diocletian at Alexandria 161

Some Extracts from Arcadius Grammaticus MS. 165

R. Bentleii Epistola ad God. Richterum 171

Correspondence 174

Annonce de Xénophon, par M. GAIL 175

Greek Poem 179

Metrical Lines contained in Various Prose Classics 181

Literary Intelligence 182

Notes to Correspondents 188

THE

CLASSICAL JOURNAL.

N°. XXIX.

MARCH, 1817.

ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΦΟΙΝΙΚΟΣ.

Part II.—[*Continued from No. XXVIII. p. 307.*]

THE language of the book of Job is generally thought to approach more nearly to the dialect of Arabia, than that of any other book in the Old Testament. Job himself was an Arabian; and the author, who celebrates him, must have been conversant with the manners, the language, and the learning of the descendants of Ishmael. We cannot wonder then, if we frequently find expressions and allusions in the book of Job, which can be best explained by the Arabic.

I am inclined to suspect, that חול, in the passage before us, is an ancient Arabic word. It is, I believe, generally admitted, that some ancient words both in Hebrew and Arabic are lost; but that in the latter language, which was once the sister dialect of the former, we can still find words used in senses, which were probably once common to both. The word حَالَ, in which the infirm *alif* is put for the infirm *waw*, because the first radical is followed by a *fatha*, has *vertere* for its first sense, though Golius makes it only the second. (See Willmet *in voce*.) From this word comes immediately حَوْلٌ *annus*. Now the phœnix and the palm-tree were both types of the year. This I shall show presently of the Phœnix; and the palm-tree was so much considered as a symbol of the year, that the Orientalists ascribed to it as many properties as there are

days in the year. One of the words for a palm-tree in Arabic is نَخْل, and this noun seems to be derived from خَلَ, by throwing away the infirm letter, and by prefixing the formative ن. Here then is an evident relationship established between the Arabic word חול, (*annus a vertendo*, says Willmet) and a word which still signifies a palm-tree in the same language. Now if we attend to the context in the chapter before us, we may be led to think, that חול, like φοῖνιξ in Greek, bore a double sense, and signified not only the phœnix, as the Rabbins say, but the palm-tree, as the LXX understood the word.—"Then I said, I shall expire in my nest, καὶ ὥσπερ ὁ φοῖνιξ I shall number my days." If this ambiguity existed in the original, as I am inclined to think it did, we see how the latter part of the verse, as implying the bird, is connected with the former, "I shall die in my nest;" and how, as implying the tree, it might have suggested the beautiful metaphors contained in the verse that follows; "My root was spread out by the waters, and the dew lay all night on my branch."

We have seen, that both سَنَة and حول signify the year, and that the primary sense of both is turning, iterating, revolving. The roots גל in Hebrew, and حل in Arabic are clearly the same; and both convey the same meaning. The author therefore seems to me to have followed the Arabic orthography in writing חול, for it is likely, that if there ever were a word in Hebrew similar in sense, and resembling in sound to the Arabic حول, it must have been גול, which might also have signified *annus a vertendo*. גלגל certainly signifies the revolving heaven; and גיל signifies age. (Dan. 1. 10.)

Let us now turn our attention from the bird and the tree to the country and the people named by the Greeks φοινίκη and φοίνικες.

I have no great doubt, that the Phœnicians called themselves בני־ענק as Bochart supposes. Some of their neighbours certainly did call themselves sons of Anak; and as this was probably considered as an honourable title, it seems likely that the Phœnicians might claim it, whether they had a genealogical right to it, or not.

The primary meaning of ענק in Hebrew, and of حَنَقَ in Arabic, is to encircle. Perhaps then the sons of Anak meant to call themselves the sons of that heaven which seems to encircle the earth, or of the orb of the day, or of the revolving year. Without ques-

tioning the existence of such a man as Anak, I think it not unlikely, that his name might be thus interpreted, and that the inhabitants of Tyre might claim kindred with their neighbours at Gaza. Titles as vain were often assumed by the Orientalists—Thus some called themselves בני-קדם "sons of the East"—some more audaciously בני-אלהים "sons of God,"—some בני-אמון "sons of Amon," by whom they probably meant the God of that name, without referring to their descent from Lot. Perhaps the true pronunciation of Beni-Anak is Beni-Chinak; and the euphonizing Greek would find *Phoinikes* to be the nearest approach to the cacophonous barbarism that his tongue could utter. Still, however, we have not obtained the derivation of Φοῖνιξ.

The Egyptians, from whom the Phœnicians seem to have obtained much of their knowledge, and from whom they probably sprang; the Egyptians, in following the usage of their own language, would frequently prefix the definite article before the name of Anak, and would call him Phanak.[1] But the same Egyptians could hardly fail to know from tradition the names of Henoch and Noach. It seems to me impossible to consider the rites performed in honour of Osiris and Adonis, or the fables told of those Gods, without seeing that they are founded upon the histories of the patriarchs. Now if the Egyptians preserved the names of Henoch and Noach, they would generally name them Phenoch, and Phinoch. The similarity of these names, and their resemblance to Phanak, might easily occasion them to be all finally mistaken for one.

The Egyptians, if they preserved any traditions of Henoch, must have remarked that he did not die, and that he abode on earth precisely as many years as there are days in the year—namely 365. Again, if they were acquainted with the history of Noach, they must have been aware, that the period from his birth to the time when he entered the ark, was 600 years, and that this period answered to the cycle called the Neros. These facts could scarcely fail to be embellished by such able mythological artificers as the Egyptians.

---

[1] Their definite article was Pi. or Phi, or contracted P, or Ph. Thus they frequently wrote P'Ousiris, Pi-Or, and Pi-Amoun for Osiris or Ousiris, for Or (Horus) and for Amoun.

It is out of the traditions then, which remained to the Egyptians of the histories of Henoch and Noach, whose names were confounded with that of Anak, that I conceive the fables told of Phœnix, the son, or grandson, of Neptune, to have been formed. The palm-tree, having been chosen as a solar symbol, was named after Henoch or Phenoch, in whom the priests of Egypt recognised the year personified; and the fabulous bird received, on a similar account, the same appellation.

There are several mythological persons who seem to me to have derived their imaginary existence from the histories of Henoch, Noach, and Anak, (or Phenoch, Phinoach, and Phanak,) confounded together and obscured by fables. Anax, the son of Cœlus and Terra, was perhaps no other than Anak mistaken for the personification of the solar orb. In Phineus, another symbol of the sun, we shall again, I think, meet with the same Anak, called Phanak by the Egyptians. Phoroneus, the son of Inachus, the son of Oceanus, seems to have had Noach for his prototype; and the same thing is probably true of Phineus, whose name is not very remote from Phinoach, since the guttural ch and the s, are, as Bochart would say, *litteræ permutabiles*. But the story of Phœnix, who, according to some, was the son of Neptune and Libya, who went with his brother Cadmus (קדם the East) in search of their sister Europa (ערבה the West), and who finally settled in Phœnicia, is clearly the work of the mythographers; nor can I doubt that this story was founded on some traditions concerning Noach, or Phinoach, confounded in Egyptian legend with Phenoch and Phanak. These persons were taken for the same; they were all considered as symbolical of the Sun; nor is it to be forgotten that the body of Osiris-Adonis was fabled to have been floated by the waves from the Nile to the shores of Phœnicia.

The primary meaning of Henoch (חנוך) is commencement, initiation. The primary meaning of Noach, or Nuch, (נח) is rest, quiet—From this last word there is a crowd of derivatives in the European languages both ancient and modern—νύξ, nox, nacht, night. Noach entered the ark at the commencement of winter; and the deified Noach, the helio-arkite God of idolators, was always worshipped as *Sol Inferus*. Osiris, Adonis, Dionysus, Pluto, were types of the Winter Sun. They represented the God of light, when he left the world to night and darkness. And

who was Phœnix, unless a symbol of the same God, when those who derived their name from him confounded Noach, or Phinoach, with Anak, or Phanak,—the God who has gone to the realms of night and rest, with the God who makes the circuit of the heavens? As Noach, or Phinoach came to be considered as the same with Nux or Nox, so was the fable of the personified Night blended with that of Phœnix. As Noach was the father of all men born since the flood, so Night was said to be the mother of all things produced since chaos. Again Erebus (ערב) the West, or the Evening, was the brother of Nox; and Europa (ערבה) the West, or the Evening, was the sister of Phœnix. One of the names of Phœnix was Ῥαββώθις, and this is an evident corruption of the oriental רבץ, or רבץ,—rest, or quiet—a name consequently that seems to identify Noach or Phinoach with Phœnix. Thus was mythology built upon historical fact.

The palm-tree was assumed by the Phœnicians as the symbol of their nation. Perhaps it was the symbol of universal Syria; for the palm-tree is to be found on some medals that represent Judea.

That the Phœnicians should have honoured this tree, which they considered as a type of the year, and of the solar orb, with the name of Phœnix, cannot now appear extraordinary, if I be right in supposing that the son, or grandson, of Neptune, who bore the name of Φοῖνιξ, was only one of the many fabulous representatives of Awak, Henoch, and Noach, whom the Egyptians would denominate Phanak, Phenoch and Phinoach, and whose names and histories appear to have been confounded together by those idolators who worshipped the host of heaven.

The bird, called also phœnix, owes its imaginary existence to the Egyptians. It was a type of renovation of the year, and of the Sun; and indeed its picture, which Herodotus more properly calls γραφή, was a mere hieroglyphic. Horus-Apollo says, that the Egyptians depicted this bird, to denote—1st, the soul dwelling for a long period here—2ndly, an inundation—3dly, a traveller returning to his native country after a long absence—and 4thly, any lasting re-establishment, or period renewed. Concerning the 1st and 2nd of these similitudes he thus expresses himself. Ψυχὴν ἐνταῦθα πολὺν χρόνον διατρίβουσαν γράψαι, ἢ πλημμύραν, Φοίνικα τὸ ὄρνεον ζωγραφοῦσι. Ψυχὴν μὲν ἐπειδὴ πάντων τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ πολυχρονιώτατον ὑπάρχει τοῦτο τὸ ζῶον· πλημμύραν δὲ ἐπειδὴ ἡλίου ἐστὶν ὁ

φοίνιξ σύμβολον οὗ μηθὲν ἐστι πλεῖον κατὰ τὸν κόσμον. *Πάντων* (lege πάντα) γὰρ ἐπιβαίνει καὶ πάντα ἐξερευνᾷ ὁ ἥλιος εἶθ' οὕτω πολὺς ὀνομασθήσεται.—He says in the next page—*Λέγεται γὰρ μᾶλλον τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων ἥλιῳ χαίρειν ὑπ' Αἰγυπτίων διὰ καὶ τὸν Νεῖλον αὐτοῖς πλημμυρεῖν, ὑπὸ τῆς θερμότητος τούτου τοῦ θεοῦ, περὶ οὗ μικρὸν ἔμπροσθεν ὁ λόγος ἀποδοθήσεται παρ' ἡμῶν.* i. e. "When the Egyptians wish to describe the soul lingering for a long time here, or an inundation, they paint the bird called the phœnix. They thus typify the soul, because this animal exceeds all others in the world in length of life; and they represent an inundation by the phœnix, because it is the symbol of the sun, than which there is nothing greater in the world, for the sun ascends above all things, and scrutinizes all, and thus is denominated *Polys* (i. e. *Multus*)"——"It is said that the Egyptians rejoice more in the Sun than any other people, because the Nile is made to inundate their country by the heat of this God, the reason of which has been given by us a little before." Now all this seems "passing strange." A bird, which is the hieroglyphic for the soul lingering here, is also the hieroglyphic for an inundation. And why? Because this bird is also the symbol of the Sun, the heat of which causes the Nile to inundate Egypt. This singular statement may perhaps be accounted for, if the word phœnix be only a corruption from Noach, or Phinoach. It is scarcely possible to suppose, that the philosophers of Egypt attributed the annual inundation of the Nile to the ardour of the Sun's rays. Of all causes of this phænomenon, this is the very last that common sense would assign for it. I cannot help suspecting then, that the phœnix was the symbol of that great inundation, which once certainly took place. The renovation of nature after so terrible a catastrophe as the flood, would be well expressed by the phœnix, the symbol of renovation.

The Egyptians strangely confounded the names of their solar symbols with the names of the Nile. Could this arise from their confusing the history of the deluge with the inundations of that river; and from their worshipping Noach, or Phinoach, under the name of Osiris, one of their principal solar symbols? The most ancient name of Egypt and of the Nile was חם, Cham. In Coptic the word for the country is Chami, or *Chemi*. Diodorus calls the river Ἀκάθης which is clearly *Ou-kemé*, or *Ou-Cheme*, the indefinite article *ou* being incorporated, as very frequently

happens, with the word. Another name of the Nile was *Siris*, which I cannot easily separate from Osiris; in fact I believe Osiris, to be Siris prefixed by the same article *Ou*. Here then it seems difficult not to recognise the similarity between the name of Cham, the son of Noach, and the names of Egypt and the Nile; while I need hardly hesitate to pronounce Osiris to be no other than the deified Noach. But Osiris was frequently represented with the head of a hawk. May not the Greeks have sometimes taken the phœnix for a hawk? (See especially Strabo l. xvii. concerning the sacred hawk at Philæ.) The Nile received one of its names from a bird, which the Greeks understood to be an eagle; and they accordingly called the river Αἰετός.

The Phœnix was the symbol of the solar year, but more particularly of the great years, or cycles. It is surprising that so judicious a writer as Tacitus should have said, that the phœnix really had been occasionally seen in Egypt. He has, however, mentioned one tradition, of which I must take notice.

Speaking of the years which elapsed between each return of the phœnix, he says, *sunt qui asseverent, mille quadringentos sexaginta unum interjici*. This period then coincides with the Sothic year, which consisted of 1461 civil years, or 1460 solar years. But observe again. The smallest cycle of the Egyptians consisted of 4 years. The days in that period amount to 1460, and when the intercalated day of the leap year is added, the number amounts to 1461.

Solinus conveys some curious intelligence to us on this subject, though he himself comprehended nothing of the matter. *Probatum est* dxl. *eum* (*nempe phœnicem*) *durare annis. Rogos suos struit cinnamis, quos prope Panchaiam concinnat, in solis urbem strue altaribus superposita. Cum hujus vita magni anni fieri conversionem rata fides est inter autores: licet plurimi eorum magnum annum non quingentis et quadraginta, sed duodecim millibus nongentis quinquaginta quatuor annis constare dicant.*

Before we proceed to examine this passage, I wish to observe, that there seems some reason to believe, that the ancient Egyptians had discovered the period, in which the fixed stars make their total apparent revolution; or to speak exactly, in which the pole of the earth moves round the pole of the ecliptic. The Arabians at an early epoch, and long before astronomy was cultivated in

modern Europe, had stated the retrograde motion of the stars to be a degree in 66 years. The calculation of the Indians is said to be much more ancient, and more exact. If then the Egyptians merited the fame which they possess, how shall we suppose, that they assigned, as Ptolemy and the Greeks of Alexandria did, 100 years for this retrograde motion through each degree, consequently making the great cycle extend to 36000 years?

The Egyptian priests told Plato, that the Greeks were children in science. The Alexandrian Greeks found only the fragments of the demolished edifice of Egyptian learning. Out of these fragments they built up a structure of their own. It was not without solidity and symmetry; but the second temple was not like to the first.

The sages of Egypt did not willingly communicate their knowledge. They wrote in hieroglyphics and spoke in enigmas. They seem frequently to have been misunderstood by their Greek disciples.

Is it not clear that an enigma, (not quite worthy of the Sphinx perhaps,) was intended, when the priests announced, that the great cycle was to be found by multiplying the Sothic year by a 2 and a 5? The Sothic year, as already stated, consists of 1460 solar years. Now 1460 multiplied by 25 give 36500. This number of years answers to no cycle whatever.

In the calculations of the orientalists, when mystery was intended, we often find units expressed by thousands, with other devices of the same kind, as Bailli, Sir W. Jones, and others have acknowledged. The thousand, for example, was sometimes considered apart from the rest of the sum. Thus the Hebrews made the thousand the leader; and called this number Aleph, as the conductor, or general.

Now in the multiplicand, in the case before us, we have 1000 for the leader, and 460 for the led. We are authorized by the enigma to employ the numbers of the multiplicator (25) as we please. Multiply the leader, 1000, by your whole multiplicator, and you will have 25000. Multiply the led, or the smaller number of your multiplicand (460) by the smaller number of your multiplicator (2) and you will have 920. Put the two sums together, and you will have 25920. But this is precisely the number of years, in which the fixed stars complete their apparent

revolution, moving backwards, as it seems to us, one degree in 72 years. It is impossible, that I could have brought out the exact sum required, where in all there are only 6 cyphers, if the authors of the enigma had not intended it.

Solinus states the great year at 12954 years. Add only six years to this immense number of years, and you will have, not the whole, but precisely the half of the great year: for at the end of 12960 years the pole of the earth performs one half of its revolution round the pole of the ecliptic, the equinoxes are removed six signs, and the fixed stars appear to us on this planet to have gone to the points opposite to those from which they were at the beginning of the period. 12960 years then make the great half year, as 25920 years make the great whole year. Now multiply the period of the phœnix, (540 years,) by the number of constellations into which the ancients divided the heavens, namely 48, and you will have precisely the sum of the great year, namely 25920 years. That the 12954 years, mentioned by Solinus, were intended to express the time, in which the stars recede to opposite positions in the heavens, can, I think, be scarcely doubted.

Pliny makes the period of the phœnix 660 years, and Suidas reduces it to 654. They probably repeated the reports which they heard, and which, it may be easily supposed, were vague and various. It is plain, that every feigned interval between the returns of the phœnix must have been intended by the inventors of that enigmatical fable, to correspond with some equal portion of the great cycle. But neither 660, nor 654, years make an equal part in 25920 years. It is likely then, that the period intended to be understood, but altered by common report, was 648 years; because 25920 divided by 40, will give us so many parts equal to 648. Now 40 was one of the mystical numbers of the Egyptians. Each successor of Apis remained 40 days in an island of the Nile, before he was brought in pomp to Memphis. Besides, if the Egyptians preserved any traditions of Noach, as I think they did, they must have known, that the flood was on the earth 40 days. It seems natural enough then, that they should divide the great period of the phœnix, of which the history seems not to be unconnected with those of Noach, or Phinoach, and Henoch or Phenoch, (whose names were probably mistaken for each other,) into 40 parts. In all events the fortieth part of the great cycle answers

to 648 years, and I am inclined to think that this was the number which Pliny and Suidas should have stated instead of 660, or 656.

The priests of Egypt obliged their kings to take an oath to preserve the year of 365 days unchanged. In consequence there was for this year a new *thoth* every fourth year. But they themselves intercalated a day every fourth year, and thus followed within a few minutes the annual revolution. Their great years were established in order to rectify the calendar, when after certain periods it became necessary, even with the use of the leap year, to alter the style. They had besides another vague year of 360 days as the circle had 360 degrees. The choice of this number seems to be in both instances sufficiently arbitrary; but we shall presently see a reason for it.

The same priests divided the ecliptic into 12 principal divisions, and the constellations, through which the ecliptic passes, into the same number of signs. Each of these signs, which the Greeks called zodiacal, because living creatures were represented as their symbols, was again divided into 3 parts, and thus the belt of constellations, called the zodiac, was partitioned into 36 divisions called decans. These were again divided into halves, and thus the whole number of these zodiacal partitions amounted to 72. But as the circle contains 360 degrees, the ecliptic was portioned into that number; and 30 degrees were of course allotted to each sign. Now these divisions of the year into 360 days; of the ecliptic into 360 degrees; of the zodiac into 72 partitions; must appear altogether whimsical and unaccountable, if the Egyptians did not know that the fixed stars retrograde a degree in 72 years, and that 360 multiplied by 72 give 25920, the exact period of the great cycle.

But while I call this the great cycle, I do so rather on account of its importance than its length. The Egyptians certainly had besides another cycle of 36000 years. This was the Neros, or cycle of 600 years, multiplied by 60. Noach was 600 years of age, when he entered the ark. Cassini, I believe, was the first of the moderns, who calculated the positions of the planets for the beginning and end of the Neros. Whether, or not, this period, multiplied by 60, gives more exact results, I cannot pretend to determine.

That the period of Noach's life, when he entered the ark, should

have corresponded with the cycle called the *Neros*, is remarkable, whether this happened by accident, or by the order of Providence. The Antediluvians, whose lives lasted for 8 or 9 centuries, must have acquired a degree of knowledge far greater than is possessed by us, who have only "just time to look about us and to die." The immediate descendants of Noach probably retained some portion of the science acquired by their long-lived ancestors; and it is not likely that Noach himself could have been ignorant, that his life had just completed a cycle when he entered the ark. In fact the very word *Neros* seems to refer us to the epoch of the deluge. It is a Greek corruption of נהר. Now נהר does not always mean a river, as I believe it is commonly understood to do. It also, and perhaps more properly, signifies what Milton (from Homer) calls the "Ocean-stream"—the flood of the deep, nay the great abyss itself (see Jonah 2. 3. and Psalm 24. 2.) The name of Nereus, the ocean-god, clearly comes from נהר. The cycle in question appears to have been known from the Nile to the Euphrates; and its name, as we have it, is to be traced to the Hebrew and Chaldaic.

The Tsabeans, or worshippers of the host of heaven, appear to have deified the antediluvian patriarchs, and to have combined the traditions concerning them with the fictitious histories of those mythological persons and symbols, which represented the celestial bodies, and all the phænomena of nature. Many circumstances lead me to think, that the fable of the phœnix was chiefly suggested to the Egyptians by the traditions which they had preserved and perverted concerning Noach, Anak and Henoch (probably called by them, according to the usage of their language, Phinoach, Phanak and Phenoch): but especially the last. "And all the days of Henoch were three hundred and sixty five years. And Henoch walked with God, and abode not, (I read ואיננו, *quasi* ואין־נו, for the ה in נוה, though radical, is, as Parkhurst observes, omissible,) for God took him." Here is a person, who lives as many years as there are days in the annual solar period. The mythologists would easily find in this person a symbol of the year and of the Sun. But Henoch did not die—he was translated from one state of existence to another—his being was continuous, though its condition were changed—"he abode not, for God took him." Here again the mythologists would compare Henoch to the annual

Sun, which abides not, and only concludes one period to commence another. The true history of Henoch, or Phenoch, might then suggest the fable of the Phœnix, that bird, which, as a symbol of the Sun and of the year, periodically renovates its existence, and reproduces itself.

It may be asked, why the Egyptians chose a bird for the hieroglyphic, by which they expressed the soul renewing its existence, and the Sun recommencing a year, or a cycle. The phœnix resembled an eagle; and the eagle in moulting—in casting its old feathers, and in acquiring new ones, presents us with a lively image of renovation. Hence was the eagle feigned to renew its youth, תתחדש כנשר נעוריכי—*renovabitur, ut aquilæ, juventus tua.* Hence during the ceremony of an apotheosis the Romans were wont to let fly an eagle.

I shall now proceed briefly to show, that the oriental traditions support my argument. That some of these traditions are absurd, and that all of them are false, I easily admit; but our business is with mythology and consequently with falsehoods.

Henoch is frequently called Edris by the Arabians. He is so called in the Koran (Surat 20). The commentators say that he received that name on account of his learning. I wonder that the page of Golius should present us with another and most absurd association, which might have been avoided. Let us remember the fact, however, that Henoch is pretty generally known to the orientalists by the name of Edris.

But the Arabians also hold, that Edris, i. e. Henoch, was the same with Elijah. (See Hottinger de Muhammedis Genealogia.)

Again the Arabians and the Jews had the tradition, that Phinehas, the son of Eleazer, revived in Elijah. (See Hottinger)

Thus the Jewish and Arabian traditions unite Henoch and Elijah, and Elijah and Phinehas. Now how came the Cabbalists to think of Phinehas?

Henoch and Elijah are the only men that have lived on this earth, and that have escaped death. The Egyptians appear to have built the fable of the Phœnix on the true history of Henoch, whom they would call Phenoch; and when the translation of Elijah took place, his disappearance in a fiery chariot probably induced the orientalists to consider him as the same with Henoch, and further to improve on their story of the Phœnix, by making

that bird revive amidst the flames. Thus Hesiod, who lived about the time of Elijah, makes no allusion to the bird's reviving from its ashes. Herodotus, who probably had the old edition of the story from the Egyptians, is equally silent on this point.

Again I ask, why the Cabbalists make Phinehas the same with Henoch and Elijah. The Rabbins may answer, that it was on account of the words at Numbers 25. 13. I reply, *cras credo, hodie nihil.* It seems plain, that the Jews and Arabians had gotten possession of some tradition, which connected the fabulous phœnix with the real individuals, Henoch and Elijah; and no doubt they fancied that the name of phœnix was to be traced to פִּינְחָס, Phinehas. This, therefore, seems to be the evident reason why they fabled, that Phinehas was revived in the person of Elijah.

The Arabians likewise tell us, that Elijah, who was the same with Henoch and Phinehas, was also the same with *Al-Choder* (See Golius *in voce* خضر). It is to be observed, that خضر, or خضير, signifies a palm-tree.

This fabulous *Al-Choder*, who was also Henoch, Phinehas, and Elijah, flourished, it is said, in the time of another imaginary person, whose name was *Aphridun* (افريدون). Now this last name is clearly from فريد *unicus fuit.* The derivation is evident. There are four *crements.* The *alif*, the initial *crement*, is merely emphatic—the *ya*, which follows the second radical, seems to refer the word to the class of diminutives—the *waw* supplies an *alif*, being motived by a *dhamma*;—and the *nun* final is formative (according to rule) of a noun from a primitive triliteral verb. I mention these particulars to show, that there can be no doubt about the derivation. Now I say, that *Aphridun* signified nothing else than the phœnix. Observe, that even at this day, when the story of the phœnix is pretty well forgotten, the Arabians still say فريد الدهر, i. e. "phœnix of the age," when they speak of an extraordinary person. (See Willmet.)

Thus then according to the Arabian traditions, Henoch was the same with Elijah, and Elijah with Phinehas. But all these three were the same with *Al-choder*, (that is ὁ φοῖνιξ *palma*,) who flourished in the time of *Aphridun* (that is ὁ φοῖνιξ *avis*.)

Upon the whole it appears to me evident, that the celebrated

fable of the phœnix has been built upon the traditions, which the *Goim* preserved and perverted of some facts recorded in the Old Testament.

Sept. 1816. W. DRUMMOND.

P. S. I forgot in my remarks on the periods to observe, that if you multiply the 72 dodecans by 12, the number of the signs, you will have 864, and that if you multiply 864 by 30, the number of degrees in each sign, you will have the number of years contained in the great cycle, viz. 25920.

COLLATIO

CODICIS HARLEIANI 5674.

CUM ODYSSEA EDITIONIS ERNESTINÆ 1760.

No. VIII.—(*Continued from No.* XXVIII. *p.* 333.)

ΟΔΥΣΣ. Ο.

3. ὑπομνήσκ et ου super α prius.

10. τῆλ' et interpr. πόρρω.

12. φάγωσιν.

13. κρήματα.

19. ἀθετεῖ ἀριστοφάνης· ἔνιοι τοὺς Γ νοθεύουσιν.

23. τεθνεώτος a m. pr. Postea η super ει additum et ο in ω mutatum.

26. κυδνὴν ex emend. certe antiqua.

27. γε omittit.

31. 32. ὑποπτεύει διονύσιος.

37. γρ. ὄτρυνε.

39. ὃς θ'.

45. νοθεύεται ὡς διαπεπλασμένος ἐξ ἐμπροσθίου τῆς κ ἰλιάδος. [158.]

52. δουρικλυτός.

62. ἔπος ηὐδα suprascr.

63. omittit.

73. ἐποτρύνει et κατερύκει, sed utroque loco η super ει.

74. ἐν πολλοῖς οὐκ ἐφέρετο· ποτὲ ἔστιν ἠσιόδειος τῆς φράσεως ὁ χαρακτήρ. εἰ δὲ ἐσκοίμεθα αὐτὸν, πρὸ τῶν πρὸ ἑαυτοῦ δύο στίχων ὀφείλει γεγράφεσθαι:

78. οἱ ἢ ἠθετοῦντο· συγκέχυται δὲ τὸ δυϊκὸν τοῦ ἀμφοτέρων: sed alter, κύδος καὶ ἀγλαΐα ἓν ἐστί. διὸ καὶ τὸ ἀμφότερον ἐπήνεγκεν.

80. τραφθῆναι text. et schol. sed supra τρα in textu scriptum ταρ. Mox ἀτόπως τὸ ἀν' ἑλλάδα· κοινὴν γὰρ τὴν ὑπὸ ἀχιλλεῖ ἑλλάδα καλεῖ ὅμηρος: Pro κοινὴν fortasse legendum μόνην.

83. ἀμπέμψει ex emend. manus ejusdem. Schol. καὶ ταῦτα ἀπρεπῶ διδάσκεσθαι πρὸς μενελάου τὸν τηλέμαχον τὸ ἀπαιτεῖν: Aliud schol. ἀμπέμψει διὰ τοῦ μ. ἔστι γὰρ ἀποπέμψει τὸ τέλειον:

91. videtur Aristophanes spurium censuisse.

95. οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον ἀθετεῖν. οὐ γὰρ δῆλοι οἱ θεράποντες ὥστε ἐν τῇ αὐτὴ οἰκίᾳ οἰκεῖν:

97. κεῖται.
101. ὅθι κ. τ.
109. 153. ἕως primo scriptum, sed ι insertum ab eadem manu in recens.
113. δῶρα δ' ὅσσ'.
114. omittit.
120. γρ. χειρὶ ἐνικῶς. Et sic textus 124.
126. πολυκράτου et σ additum m. antiqua.
128. ἀρίσταρχος κεῖσθαι.
130. χερσὶ et supra γρ. χειρί.
137. παρὰ δὲ (sic.)
139. omittit.
141. οὕτω διὰ τοῦ ο. [οἰνοχόει.]
144. καὶ τότε.
145. 190. τ' ἐξεύγνυντ'.
146. ἠριδούπου text. et schol. et 191. text.
149. λείψαντε et suprascr. σπείσαντες.
152. οὕτως εἰπεῖν οὐκ εἴπετον :
155. εἵως ἐνὶ τρ. vide ad 109.
157. ὀδυσῆι ἐνὶ et in marg. ἀττικὸν ἐστὶν ὡς ἤρωι λαομεδοντι πολίσσαμεν: [Il. H. 453.]
168. ἦ et εἰ adscriptum ; sed schol. τὸ δεύτερον περισπαστέον ὡς ἐρωτηματικόν :
172. ἔνιοι μυθήσομαι.
174. ἥρπαξεν ἀτιταλλομένην.
178. κακόν.
184. σεῖον text. et schol.
186. ἐς Φηρὰς δ'. Schol. διὰ τοῦ η τὴν πόλιν τὴν λακωνικήν.
187. ἀρτιλόχοιο.
197. εἰμένη.
200. μή μ' ὁ γέρων.
201. χρεώ.
209. δὲ habet pro τε et νῦν omittit.
213. οὐδέ ἐ ex emend.
215. ἕκαστε.
227. ἡ γραφὴ μετὰ ἀντὶ τοῦ ν.
228. ἄλλων.
231. vulgatam habet.
237. δὲ pro τε.
239. γρ. ὄθι.
240. πολλοῖσι τ' ἀνάστων.
241. ὑψηρεφὲς et 423. 431.
242. supra μάντιον scriptum ὡς φήμιον. i. e. hæ voces eundem accentum habent. Hinc nata est varia lectio, a Clarkio memorata, φήμιον.
244. ἀρίσταρχος διὰ τοῦ α· ζηνίδοτος διὰ τοῦ η : Infra 253. ἀμφιάρηος et α super η.
266. γρ. καταλίξω.
272. τοι et suprascr. δή.
274. ἀχαιῶν.
276. γρ. κατὰ χρόνους.
283. τόν' et νηός.
284. ἐβήσετο.
296. τὰς Φηρὰς Φερὰς εἶπε διὰ τὸ μέτρον· γρ. καὶ Φειὰς· περὶ ἧς Φησίν· Φειὰς παρ τείχεσσιν ἰαρδάνου ἀμφὶ ῥέεθρα : [Il. H. 135.]
299. εἴ pro ᾗ bis, sed ex emend.
300. κλισίης.
303. τοῖς δ'.
304. εἴ μ' ἔα', sed in marg. εἴ μιν. Mox φιλέει et οι super ει.
306. νῦν εὔομαι, et inter voces suprascr. μ'.
309. γρ. καί μ' ἠγεμόνα.
316. ὅτ' ἐθέλοιεν (sic). Schol. τὸ δὲ ἐθέλοιεν, οὕτως αἱ ἀριστάρχου φασὶ τρισυλλάβως τὸ ἐθέλω : [Voluit ὅττ' ἐθέλοιεν].
320. ἐρύσσειε.
322. ὑπτῆσαί τε.
344. ὧν τιν' et ὃν super ὧν.
353. φθεῖσθαι.
370. ἔτι δεύομαι.
376. φᾶσθαι.
386. ἐπέρασσαν.
392. ἀρίσταρχος ἀκούειν ὡς εὐδειν.
394. ὄντινα.
412. ἐβασίλευε.
419. τις et suprascr. γρ. ᾗ.
421. ᾗ κ' text. ex emend. sed ita plane schol.
422. ἠρώτα δὴ "πειτα.
431. ὄφρα ἴδηι et in marg. γρ. ὄφρ' ἴδῃς.

433. 438. ἀμείβετο et ψατο supra βετο.

436. ἐπάμυνον. Schol. marg. ἐπάμυνον· οὐκ ἀπάμυνον· ἀπωμόσαι γὰρ τὸ μὴ ποιῆσαι:

440. ξυμβλήμενες.

441. πρὸς δῶμα.

446. πρὸς pro ἐς.

447. εἴη et hunc versum sequenti subjungit.

455. ἐμπιλόωντο, sed ο super ε.

457. ἦκαν et suprascr. οἶκον.

459. γρ. ἠλίκτορσιν. Deinde ἔρτο, sed κ insertum ex recens. Schol. deducit ἀπὸ τοῦ εἴρω.

461. χερσί τ' γρ. χείρεσσιν.

465. δέπας. Schol. ἐκτατέον τὸ δέπας ποτήριον. [Lege δέπα.]

466. ἀμφεπένοντο.

472. ἀνδρῶν ἦν.

474. ἀναβησόμενοι et α super ο ex recens.

476. ὅτε δὴ ἕβδομον.

487. ἔδηκε et suprascr. ἔδωκε, sed ἔδηκε bis schol.

496. sch. προέρεσσον διχῶς:

503. ἀγορὴν ἐπείσομαι et suprascr. ἐπελεύσομαι. Schol. infra ad Π. 130. citat ἀγορὴν ἐπελεύσομαι.

513. οὐ γάρ τι ξ.

517. ἤκοιο.

525. εἶκε (sic.)

530. γρ. ἤλυθε.

532. γένος ex emend.

559. vulgatam habet MS. et in marg. οὕτως ἀρίσταρχος:

545. τὸν δὲ τ' ἐγώ.

547. αὐτεὶς ἀ.

548. εἰσβαινον, sed ἔσβαινον in marg.

ΟΔΥΣΣ. Π.

1. πλισίης ex emend. manus antiquæ. Deinde δῖος plane.

16. ἁλαερὸν κατὰ δάκρυον εἶβον γρ. θαλερὸν δὲ οἱ ἔκπιπτε δάκρυ:

17. ἀγαπάζῃ.

29. ἐσορᾶν (sic).

35. χάτει ἐνευναίων· ἄμφω δοτικά.

44. ἦσο ξεῖν'.

49. τοῖσιν δ' αὖ πίνακας κρητῶν.

50. κατέλιπον et ει super ι.

51. παρεσήνεον.

56. θεῖον et supra γρ. δῖον.

58. εὐχετόωντο a manu prima, sed αι ex emendatione antiqua. Interpretamentum inter lineas λέγουσιν.

59. γάρ τοι ἔ.

65. παρὰ νηός.

66. primo scripserat πρὸσταθμον, deinde α superimposuit inter π et ρ et ὸ in ὰ mutavit. Deinde σοι a m. pr. τοι ex emend.

67. ἐδέλης.

69. θυμαλγὲς ἔειπες. et suprascr. λυπηρόν.

ει

74. κομίζῃ.

79. Videntur aliqui legisse ἔσσωμεν.

85. ἐάσω.

91. θὴν et suprascr. δή. Cum hic locus, tum v. 69. ostendere poterunt, quam facile explicationes in varias lectiones transeant. Hesychius: Θήν διὰ τοῦ η τὸ αὐτό. Sic audacissime interpolavit Musurus. MS. habet, teste Schowio, Θήν, διὰ ἡ που. Ita scilicet olim

ἡ

scriptum erat Θήν. δια που. Lege igitur, Θήν. δή. ποῦ. Οὐ μὲν θὴν Il. Θ. 448. reddit Scholiastes οὐ μὲν δή. Apollonius Lexico, Θήν. ποῦ. citans Iliad. P. 29.

99. ἀρίσταρχος ἐπὶ θυμῷ. Schol. etiam ἐπὶ, sed ἐνὶ verbis suis præfigit.

101. νοθεύεται ὡς περιττὸς:

104. ἀθερεῖ ζηρόδοτος.

105. αὖ μ' ἐν ex emend.

115. κασιγνήτους ex emend.

119. αὖτ'.

121. τῶ νῦν.

130. γρ. περίφρονι.

131. vulgata lectio a m. pr. nunc ex emend. εἰπεῖν et nescio quid præterea. Salvus esset versus, si legeretur: εἰπεῖν, ὡς σῶς εἰμί.

138. *εἰ καὶ* et in marg. *γρ. ἦ* et supra *ἦ* scriptum *ἄρα*. Si igitur varietas *ἦ ἄρα* fideliter a Clarkio e MS. notata est, hic quoque glossa pro varia lectione invasit. Nam solæ variæ lectiones sunt *ἦ καὶ* et *εἰ καί*.

143. *γρ. καὶ ἔμπης* [pro *αὕτως*]

151. *γρ. μᾶρς*.

152. 153. videntur *νοθεύεσθαι* a quibusdam.

165. *παρὰ* ex emendatione ejusdem manus

176. *γενειάδες* sine ulla varietate.

184. *κεχρησμένα δώμεν*.

185. *γρ. δ' ἡμῶν*.

195. *ἡ κυκλικὴ θέλγεις*.

197. *γρ. οἱ*.

205. *πολλὰ δ' ἀληθεῖς*.

215. *ὧρτο* et *σε* supra *το*.

217. *αἰγυπτιοί*.

218. *πετεηνά*.

223. *εὐχετόωντο*.

224. *γάρ τι σι*. (Erratum ed. Ernest.)

236. *ὄρᾳ* *οἱ ἰδεῖν* in textu post rasuram, sed in margine *ὄφραιδέω* (sic).

242. *αἰχμητήν* *τ'* *ἔμμεναι*.

245. *οὔτε δύ'*.

246. *γρ. ἀλλὰ πολλοὶ πλεῖον*.

249. *φῶτες ἔασιν* et *γρ. ἀχαιῶν* super *ἔασιν*.

251. *κούρει ἀχαιῶν*.

257. *φράζεν* a m. pr. *φράζε'* ex emend.

260. *εἴ κεν*.

263. *ἐπ' ἀμύντορε*.

273. *ἠὲ γέροντι*.

274. *σὸν δέ*.

277. *γρ. σὺ δ' ὁρόων*.

279. *οὗτι*.

280. *ἡ γάρ* e rasura.

281—298. *ιη νοθεύονται*. Aliud schol. *ἀθετεῖ Ζηνόδοτος*.

291. *πρὸς δέ τι καί*, sed *ο* nunc additum supra *τι* et *μοι* inter *τι* et *καί*.

303. *οἰκείων* et *ϊ* super *ει*.

304. ad *ἰθὺν*, ut videtur, *οὕτως αἱ ἀριστάρχου*.

305. *περιφθείμεν*. Schol. *ὁ ἀσκαλωνίτης ἐτεοδμεώων τῶν ἀγαθῶν θεραπόντων· τινὲς δὲ οὕτως ὀτρεϊδμώων*.

306. *νῶι*.

310. *μέ γ' ἔχουσιν* a manu pr. *με τ' ἔ.* ex emend. In margine var. lect. *γέ μ' ἔχουσι* a manu recentiori, seculi fortasse 14mi declinantis.

315. *οὐδέ τι φειδώ*.

317. *αἴ σέ τ' ἀ.* text. *γρ. αἴ τέ σ' α.* marg. Deinde *ηλιτεῖς*.

330. *μὲν* omittit.

332. *εἴβοι* et *η* super *οι*.

337. *ἐκ πύλου ἦλθεν γρ. εἰλήλουθε*.

346. *γρ. ἐτελέσθη*.

351. *ἀρ'* omittit.

354. *γρ. προσεφώνεεν*.

357. *κιχάνει* et suprascr. *γρ. κιχῆσαι*.

366. *καταδύντι* et *αν* super *ντ*, ut videatur voluisse *καταβάντι*.

370. *μὲν* omittit.

372. *ἡμέας*.

376. *ἐκεῖνον*.

387. *βούλεσθε* a m. pr. *αι* pro *ο* ex emend.

391. *ἡ δέ κ'* et *ἔεδνοισιν*.

392. *ὀσκε* et *τις* supra *κε*.

399. *ὄσφιν*.

404. *τε κτεϊέν*.

408. *ξεστοῖσι λίθοισιν*.

417. *ἐνέειπεν*.

428. *ἀπορραίσε φίλον κῆρ*.

432. *ἐιεί τε*.

433. *παύεσθαι* a manu prima, *σ* insertum a recentiori.

434. *γρ. πεπνυμένος*.

435. *περίφρων*.

436. *μελέσθων* in marg. sive var. lect. sive interpr. Sed prius puto.

447. *ἔκ γε*.

453. *ὠπλίζοντο*, sed *ο* super *ω* et in marg. *οὕτως διὰ τοῦ ο*.

461. *ἦλθες δὴ, εὖμαιε*.

466. *γρ. ἀνώγει*.

470. *τόγε*.

481. *κοίτου τε μνήσαντο* text. *γρ. δὴ τότε κοιμήσαντο*.

DESULTORY REMARKS ON JUVENAL.

(1.)

"—— Atque ideo nulli comes exeo, tanquam
Mancus, et extinctæ corpus non utile dextræ."

Sat. iii. vv. 47, 48.

I need not remind the reader that the person represented as here speaking is a Roman of the old stamp, who, finding himself quite out of his element in a corrupt and degenerate city, quits it for a remote solitude.

The last line has given infinite trouble to the commentators; as indeed a passage of any difficulty always will do to those, who, instead of deducing the sense of it from a rigorous construction of the words, fix the sense first and then try to construe the words accordingly. A vague idea has occupied them that Umbritius intended to compare himself to a withered or an amputated hand. Therefore we are told that the expression *corpus non utile extinctæ dextræ* is by a certain monstrous figure put for *extincta dextra non utilis corpori*. The idea has infected some of the translators. "Juvenal," (says the author of a recent and spirited version) "means, though his words are lax, that, as a withered hand is useless to the body, so is an honest man to Rome." If Juvenal meant this, he must have meant more; for, to complete the comparison, we must suppose him to imply that as a withered and useless hand is separated from the body, so is an honest man from Rome.

But I never heard that persons who had the misfortune of having maimed or disabled limbs made a point of amputating them; and as little can I conceive that Juvenal would have used the maimed and perverted mode of expressing himself, which this construction supposes. Besides, is it probable that in the same sentence and the same line he would have compared Umbritius both to the body which had lost the hand, and to the hand which had lost the body? But this must be maintained by the critics in question; for *mancus* indisputably means *one who is maimed or disabled in the right hand*.

The rest of the line therefore must be so translated as to harmonize with "mancus;" and it would not be unnatural to expect that it was only a periphrastical mode of expressing the same idea. This sort of

periphrastical amplification is usual with Juvenal; witness the very next couplet, "Conscius,—et cui fervens, &c. &c." Accordingly, the literal rendering of the words before us, (only taking *extinctæ dextræ* as the genitive case,) is "the incapacitated body of a destroyed right hand;" that is, the incapacitated body attached to a destroyed right hand; or more simply, the body which has its right hand destroyed. The laxity, or rather the harshness, of the passage consists wholly in this, that Juvenal speaks of the body as belonging to the hand, whereas we usually speak of the hand as belonging to the body. But both modes of expression are admissible; nor do I think it necessary to read with Markland "extinctâ dextrâ;" though certainly the sense would be made clearer by the change. The object of Umbritius undoubtedly is, to compare himself to a soldier who being disabled in the *sword-hand*, retires or is dismissed from the ranks as unserviceable.

(2.)

"Miratur vocem angustam, qua deterius nec
Ille sonat quo mordetur gallina marito."

Ib. vv. 90, 91.

It would not be worth our while to bestow any attention on the line which forms the second of this couplet, were it not that it illustrates a characteristic peculiarity of the author. Juvenal is fond of periphrasis; and especially of designating particular persons, objects or places by circumlocutory expressions; as where, having occasion to allude to Socrates, he does not name him, but describes him as *dulci senex vicinus Hymetto*. Sometimes these circuitous designations have great beauty or propriety; at others, they are mere excrescences, or have no other effect than to give our poet's composition a sort of mock-heroic air. Examples of the latter class are where, instead of *a soldier*, he tells us of the man *qui tegitur parma et galea*; or where he talks of a sacrifice, not to *Minerva*, but to her who *pugnavit Gorgone Maura*; or where he describes the dead as going down, not to *Pluto*, but *ad generum Cereris*; or where he counsels a poor poet to consign his verses, not to *the flames*, but *Veneris marito*. In these and similar instances, the circumlocution has no particular force; it seems only the effect of *manner*, and perhaps does not bespeak the best taste. Surely then it is quite in character for the same writer, where he would speak of a cock, to designate the animal as *gallinæ maritus*, or, which is the same thing, as *ille quo utitur gallina marito*

or as *ille quo mordetur gallina marito*. This in my opinion, is all that is meant to be conveyed by that line; and the trouble and the folly that it has cost some of the commentators might have been saved, had they been more attentive to the characteristic peculiarities of their author's manner, and less ingenious in conjecturing his meaning.

I will only add that the words "quo marito" must be considered as a case of what is called (I say not how properly) the ablative absolute. Nor do I see that to say "illo marito mordetur" is harsher than such an expression as "illo magistro eruditur," which would be good Ciceronian Latin. As to the objection that the ancients sometimes considered the tone of a cock's voice as peculiarly manly, it is too ridiculous to deserve attention.

(3.)

"Surgitur et misso proceres exire jubentur
Concilio, quos Albanam Dux magnus in arcem
Traxerat attonitos et festinare coactos."

Sat. iv. vv. 144—6.

By *attonitos*, some commentators understand that the senators had been astonished by the suddenness of Domitian's summons. But the senators were always liable to be summoned suddenly by the chief magistrate; and the emperors found them such convenient tools, that the exercise of this power under the imperial government could not but be sufficiently frequent. I apprehend therefore that *attonitos* here means *anxious* or *dismayed*; feelings without which Domitian's senates probably never met their master. It is difficult for a modern reader to bear in mind that the ancient word *attonitus* has not the confined sense of its derivatives in the modern languages, but implies almost *any* suspension or violent derangement of the faculties, from whatever cause. Yet some of the versions render the word as meaning *astonished* both here and in other parts of Juvenal, where the poet does not appear so to have intended it. Vid. Sat. iv. 77, Sat. vii. 67, et Sat. xiv. 306.

(4.)

"Templorum quoque majestas præsentior; et vox,
Nocte fere media, mediamque audita per urbem,
Littore ab Oceani Gallis venientibus, et Diis
Officium vatis peragentibus, his monuit nos."

Sat. xi. v. 111. et seqq.

This passage would in point of construction be very clear, were it not for one single monosyllable,—*his*. What is the antecedent to this relative? Most of the commentators construe *his* as if it had been *ex his templis*: supposing the warning voice to have issued out of a temple. So the ellipsis is supplied by Mr. Gifford;

> "And solemn sounds, *heard from the sacred walls*,
> At midnight's solemn hour, announced the Gauls."

And so also by Mr. Hodgson;

> "A solemn warning *from the temple giv'n*
> Proclaim'd the present Majesty of Heav'n."

But nothing can be more certain than that this rendering is erroneous. The monitory voice issued from no temple. Livy tells us that it was heard by Marcus Cæditius (the only person who heard it at all) "*in nova via, ubi nunc sacellum est, supra ædem Vestæ;*" and that, after the departure of the Gauls, a temple was erected in the *nova via*, in expiation of the neglect with which the warning had been treated; which temple was dedicated to *Aius Locutius*. Plutarch adds, (what indeed is sufficiently implied in Livy) that this temple was built on the very spot where the voice had been heard. Now if it be supposed that the voice proceeded from the temple of Vesta, why does Livy say only that it was heard on the Nova Via *beyond* that temple, and why was not the expiatory shrine consecrated to Vesta rather than to that barbarous piece of deified etymology, Aius Locutius? On the other hand, if the voice proceeded from some other temple than that of Vesta, why does Livy name only the latter? And, on either supposition, how should or could a new temple be built on the very spot where an old one already stood, or, if we conceive the old one to have been taken down or destroyed by the Gauls, whence the silence of the historians respecting so remarkable a circumstance?

I therefore conclude that this warning voice was heard in the open air; and this is confirmed by a speech which Livy afterwards puts into the mouth of Camillus; "Quid hæc tandem urbis nostræ clades nova? Num ante exorta est, quam spreta *vox cœlo emissa* de adventu Gallorum?" (Liv. 5. c. 51.)

The reference, then, of *his* to *templis* understood, is not to be admitted, even were it tenable in point of construction; for Juvenal was too accurate to deviate from history, and I may add that he evidently had his eye on Livy throughout the passage. But it is often easier, in criticism at least, to prove a negative than a positive; and though I

think the construction in question (and let me say, every other that has been put on the words) wrong, I know not what to substitute. May it not be conjectured that the text is corrupt, and that for "*his*," we should read "*hoc*" or "*id*," sc. *Gallos venire?*

If the text is to stand, it may perhaps be allowable to take *his* for *his dictis* or *his monitis*, and then the sense would be the same, only more harshly expressed, as if we read *hoc* or *id*, that is *Gallos venire*. In that case, the whole sentence might be paraphrased thus; "When the Gauls were approaching, a prophetic voice, by the immediate agency of the Gods, *warned us to that effect*." *Monita deorum* (a well-known phrase for such warnings, and used by Livy on this very occasion,) may be supposed implied in *monuit*. The same ellipsis, applied indeed to a human warning, occurs in Ovid; where, after giving some good advice to a friend, he thus continues;

> "*His* ego si monitor *monitus* prius ipse *fuissem*,
> In qua debebam forsitan urbe forem."
>
> Trist. lib. 3. el. 4.

(5.)

> "——— prius quam
> Sumeret agrestem posito diademate falcem
> Saturnus fugiens; tunc cum virguncula Juno,
> Et privatus adhuc Idæis Jupiter antris."
>
> Sat. xiii. vv. 38. et seqq.

Most of the commentators seem to understand "privatus" as meaning *secret, concealed*, Jupiter having been concealed in the caves of Ida from his father's fury. Others more properly take it to denote *a subject, a private person*. The word "privatus" never has the former sense in the classics. It is true that the lexicographers give that as one of its meanings, and refer to a passage in Ovid as an example. But let the reader hunt through the classics; the word is of frequent occurrence; and it may safely be affirmed that he shall consecutively find two hundred instances of its use, without lighting on one example where it does not mean either private as opposed to *in common with others*, or private as opposed to *a public station*. If so, he will surely suspect that the lexicographers have misinterpreted the Ovidian passage in question; and on turning to it, his suspicions will be verified. It is to be found in the Trist. lib. 3. eleg. 1. This elegy is an address supposed to be delivered by the book itself on entering Rome from which its author had been banished. The book

describes itself as avoiding from fear the imperial palace, and as successively repelled in its attempt to gain admittance into each of the three public libraries. It however expresses a fervent hope that Cæsar may one day relent from his wrath, and then proceeds thus,

> " Interea, quoniam statio mihi publica clausa est,
> Privato liceat delituisse loco :
> Vos quoque, si fas est, confusa pudore repulsæ
> Sumite plebeiæ carmina nostra manus."

What can be plainer? Finding the imperial residence and the public libraries inaccessible, the book requests that it may not be debarred from an admittance into some *private* library, that is, into the library of some subject, and may be read by persons of plebeian, that is, of humble rank. The lexicographers have here been misled by finding *privato loco* joined with *delituisse*. I doubt whether even the word " delituisse " does not here denote rather insignificance and obscurity than concealment. But, if not, it would only follow that the house of a subject was a very good lurking-place, without supposing that *privatus* does itself convey that idea.

(6.)

> " Nam genus hoc vivo jam decrescebat Homero ;
> Terra malos homines nunc educat atque pusillos ;
> Ergo Deus quicunque aspexit, ridet et odit."
>
> Sat. xv. vv. 69. et seqq.

" Malos " here has generally (I believe universally) been understood to mean *wicked*, or at least *weak-minded* and *cowardly ;* and the rendering has great plausibility from the context. " Odit," says the Delphin editor, " malos, ridet pusillos." But I can see no force or even propriety in the word so understood, where the subject is simply the decline of the species in bodily strength. Besides, if this is the meaning, mankind must have begun to be *mali* as well as *pusilli* in Homer's time ; which could hardly be meant, as Homer does not say it. My belief therefore is, that *malos* here means, not weak-*minded*, but weak-*bodied*. It is true technical phraseology, like that of a recruiting serjeant, who by " a good man " would mean " an able-bodied man." The point may be illustrated by a reference to Aristotle, where, in speaking of the actions and characters of men as the objects of poetic imitation, he observes that " Homer represents men as *better* than they are, Cleophon exactly *as* they are, and Hegemon and Nicocharis as *worse*." "Ὁμηρος μὲν βελτίους, Κλεοφῶν δὲ ὁμοί-

ους, Ἠγήμων δὲ ὁ Θάσιος ὁ τὰς παρῳδίας ποιήσας πρῶτος, καὶ Νικόχαρις ὁ τὴν Δηλιάδα, χείρους." Poetic. ii. On which passage I cannot forbear transcribing a part of the excellent annotation of Twining. "It is necessary to remember here, the *wide* sense in which the Ancients used the terms *virtue, vice, good, bad*, &c. The difference between *moral* and *poetical* perfection of character is well explained by Dr. Beattie, Essay on Poetry, &c. part i. ch. 4. The heroes of Homer, as he well observes, are '*finer animals*' than we are; not *better men*."

If, then, Homer's characters may in this sense be termed *better* than we are, we may, in comparison with them, be termed *bad*. We are *mali*,—a *sorry* kind of animal,—a *poor* and *degenerate* race of human beings.

This phraseology was well known to Homer himself. He repeatedly uses the word *ἀμείνων* or its synonymes, for mere animal superiority. Thus we are told that Hector was "*far better*" than Menelaus, —*πολὺ φέρτερος ἦεν*. And thus too Agamemnon dissuades Menelaus from single combat with the redoubted Trojan,—

> "Μηδ' ἔθελ' ἐξ ἔριδος σεῦ ἀμείνονι φωτὶ μάχεσθαι,
> Ἕκτορι Πριαμίδῃ, τόν τε στυγέουσι καὶ ἄλλοι·
> Καὶ δ' Ἀχιλεὺς τούτῳ γε μάχῃ ἐνὶ κυδιανείρῃ
> Ἐρρίγ' ἀντιβολῆσαι, ὅπερ σέο πολλὸν ἀμείνων."
>
> Il. H. 105. seqq.

I choose this passage, because here it is impossible to suppose that the superiority, which is spoken of, is not purely animal. In any other sense, Agamemnon would never have admitted that Menelaus was "*worse*" than Hector, still less than Achilles.

The same mode of expression is used by Horace, where he tells us that Tydides was a "*better man*" than his father; "*Tydides melior patre.*"

(7.)

> "——— Quæ tanta fames, infestaque vallo
> Arma, coëgerunt tam detestabile monstrum
> Audere? Anne aliam, terra Memphitide sicca,
> Invidiam facerent nolenti surgere Nilo?"
>
> Ibid. vv. 120. et seqq.

The latter of these sentences is one of the most difficult passages in Juvenal. Two renderings have been given of it; the substance of which may be thus exhibited. First; "Were the Nile reluctant to rise and to fertilize the country by his accustomed inundation, what

other course could these people take effectually to enrage that river, and still farther to increase his unwillingness?" Second; "Were the Nile reluctant to rise, and the country suffering under a grievous famine, to what more horrid rite of expiation could the people resort than this sort of human sacrifice, in order to shame the river and to act on his cruel waters as a spell?"

In the former interpretation I can see neither force nor pertinency; and if it had both, it is by no fair means deducible from the words. It has no relation to the context. It makes a passage, which is awkward enough at any rate, clumsy beyond all utterance; for why say so much,—nay, why say any thing,—of the *previous* reluctance of the river, and nothing of the sole point in question, his reluctance afterwards? Lastly, it gives a wrong sense to the phrase *invidiam facere alicui*, which, like its synonymes, *invidium parare alicui*, *invidiam concitare alicui*, is perfectly known to mean, not *to excite the odium of*, but *to bring odium upon*.

The other sense may be collected from the words with far less violence,—indeed with as little as in the case of so stubborn a passage can possibly be hoped. It also harmonizes far better with the context, in which the poet asks whether this detestable cruelty had been occasioned by famine. It gives great force and meaning to the phrase "invidiam facere;" and the supposition which it makes respecting the object and intention of the Tentyrites is perfectly consistent with the known character and genius of the more horrid superstitions of antiquity. Some of the commentators well support it by quoting from Ovid a story of Busiris, who, when Egypt had suffered a long drought, propitiated Jupiter by a human sacrifice. In this view, the phraseology of the passage may be illustrated by an expression in Seneca, which has not, as far as I know, been quoted by the commentators. When the ghost of Achilles demands the sacrifice of Polyxena, Agamemnon, wishing to dissuade Pyrrhus from a compliance, says, "Detrahe invidiam tuo odiumque patri, quem coli pœna jubes."

Yet, though I think this interpretation very *near* the truth, it does not strike me as fully right. The force of the question put in the passage must obviously consist in the idea that the situation of necessity supposed would justify, or at least palliate, the atrocity committed; but Juvenal could never have admitted the justification of human sacrifices in any case. Within a few lines of this very passage, he calls them a "nefandum sacrum." The greatest defect, however, of this interpretation is of another kind.

Let it be observed that the whole intent and end of this satire is to condemn and brand the Tentyrites, not for *killing* a man, but for *eating* him. A homicide committed in the course of a violent riot and affray, is an occurrence common enough in all countries: it was the *cannibalism* that succeeded, which Juvenal meant to hold up to such bitter and peculiar reprobation, and to represent as so black and distinguishing a stain on the Egyptian name. With this idea he begins—"Carnibus humanis vesci licet;"—with this he concludes—"non sufficit iræ occidisse aliquem, &c.;"—of this every part, every allusion, every illustration,—the Læstrygons—the Cyclops—the Vascons—the Saguntines—the Tauric Chersonese,—in short, all—or nearly all—are full. To complete the matter, this is the idea he is more peculiarly pressing in the very context of the passage in question, as the lines above quoted will show. Now it does not well harmonize with this idea, to ask whether the cruel deed of the Tentyrites was intended as an expiatory sacrifice. Such expiation would have referred only to the *murder* of the unfortunate Ombite, not to the devouring his body. It is true that certain portions of the victims offered in the ancient sacrifices were eaten; but this was only incidental; it constituted no part of the sacred rite itself.[1] Besides, we never read even this of their human sacrifices. The victim was slain, but there appears no reason to believe that any part of his body was eaten. On the contrary, we seem to have Juvenal's own authority, and in this very satire, for believing otherwise; for he expressly says, that the horrible Tauric sacrifices were confined to simple immolation, without any cannibalism. The supposition, therefore, of an expiatory rite would have had no bearing on his subject, which was the cannibalism committed on the Ombite captive. Having specifically declared that the mystery of wickedness which so confounded him was not the killing but the eating, he would hardly have

[1] I enter not here into the question, whether sacrifices *originated* in the notion of eating with the Gods; a question, of which some eminent authors have maintained the affirmative side. Such certainly was not the theory of sacrifices in their mature state. But, whether it was so or not, my present purpose will be sufficiently answered by remarking, that even writers who are strong for the *festal* character of a sacrifice, admit the case of expiatory or deprecatory sacrifices to be an exception. In these, it seems that the worshipper did not partake; as considering himself unworthy to sit at table with the offended divinity. See Magee on Atonement and Sacrifice, Vol. i. No. 49.

proposed a solution which, after all, could only explain, not the eating but the killing.

These considerations, together with a close regard to the context, may lead us to what I humbly conceive to be the right explication of this puzzling passage. The poet had before observed that there were cases which might palliate, though they could not positively justify, the feeding on human flesh. The Vascons and the Saguntines, closely besieged by their respective enemies, and reduced to famine, had excusably resorted to this dreadful expedient. But, now recurring to this subject, he proceeds to ask, in the lines under review, what similar apology could be found for the Tentyrites. I shall offer a paraphrase of the passage, according to this conception of it, and, after the observations already made, shall leave it to the candid examination of the reader.

"What afflicting exigence impelled the Tentyrites to this act? By what mighty stress of hunger were they oppressed? By what hostile weapons and besieging armies were they blockaded, and thus reduced, after exhausting their provisions, to the dreadful and monstrous resource of feeding on their fellow-men? Should the Nile refuse to overflow his banks, and should the land of Egypt be in consequence parched with a destructive drought, even in that case, could the inhabitants do worse than thus to devour one another, thus bringing a heavy reproach on the river for his cruel obstinacy?"

NUMITOR.

OBSERVATIONS ON

Dr. MALTBY'S *Edition of* MORELL'S *Lex. Gr. Pros.*

PART II. [*Continued from No.* xxvii. p. 91.]

THE author of the Critical *Notice of Dr. Maltby's Edition of Morell's Lexicon Graeco-Prosodiacum*, inserted in Mus. Crit. Cant. vi. supposes that "in all the instances, enumerated by Dr. Maltby, in which the Greek Epigrammatists have either licentiously or ignorantly violated the laws of prosody, the fault is rather charge-

able upon copyists or editors than on the original authors." But how can it be supposed that the copyists or editors should have blundered in all the sixteen instances adduced? The 8th instance, quoted by the learned, but anonymous critic, is this—

"*Πάπυρος*, Antipater *of Sidon*. p. 561.

Λαμπάδα κηρυχίτωνα, Ἐρίνυν τυφήρεα λύχνον,
Σχοίνῳ καὶ λεπτῇ σφιγγόμενον παπύρῳ.

We cannot bring ourselves to believe that so correct a writer [as] Antipater should have made such a blunder. The reader will observe that *λεπτῇ* is in the feminine gender, whereas *πάπυρος* is masculine. The asterisk is found, to idem litteris, in Suid. v. *Τυφήρεα* [et v. *Παπύρῳ*.] We would read,

——— *τυφήρεα λύχνον*
Ἐκ σχοίνων λεπτῆ σφιγγόμενόν τε βύβλῳ.

To make this conjecture probable, we observe, first, that these torches were bundles of small rushes. Photius: *Φανός· λαμπὰς ἡ ἐκ κλημάτων. Πανός· δέσμη κληματίδων.* Secondly, *ἐκ* and *καὶ* are frequently confounded. See Bast. ad Gregor. p. 746. So also are *ῳ* and *ων*. Thirdly, *βύβλος* is the word usually employed by Greek authors in speaking of the Egyptian plant alluded to. See Athen. xv. 676. d. Nicander Alex. 362. Æschylus Suppl. 757. [768.] Xenoph. Anab. vii. p. 542. Eustath. ad Odyss. *Φ*. p. 1913, 31. Fourthly, *παπύρῳ* is to be attributed to some scholiast, who wrote it in the margin, or immediately above *βύβλῳ*. Nothing is more common than the intrusion of glosses; but it is sufficient to give an instance where the very same accident has happened. Photius: *Φιλύρα· φυτὸν ἔχον φλοιὸν βύβλῳ παπύρῳ ὅμοιον.* Kuster on Suidas proposes *βύβλῳ ἢ παπύρῳ*. But the words are synonymous. It is evident that *παπύρῳ* was the explanation of some copyist."

1. The writer is mistaken in attributing to Antipater Sidonius the epigram above mentioned. It was the composition of Antipater Thessalonicensis, and occurs in Brunck's Anal. t. ii. p. 112. Jacobs' Anthol. t. ii. p. 98.

2. The writer quotes the verse of Antipater, as if it were *σφιγγόμενον*, not *σφιγγομένῳ*, and the verse is so cited by Salmasius, whose words we shall soon produce. But Jacobs, who is silent about the other lection, gives *σφιγγομένῳ*, which is without doubt the true reading, and which is found in Suidas v. *παπύρῳ* et *τυφήρεα*, and also in Phavorinus v. *παπύρῳ*.

3. Were we inclined to adopt the proposed substitution of *βύβλῳ* for *παπύρῳ*, yet we could not assent to the great alterations made in the second verse for the purpose of introducing it.

4. Though we admit that "*ἐκ* and *καὶ* are frequently confounded," and that *ῳ* and *ων* may be "frequently confounded," yet we must be allowed to doubt whether it be within the rules of *sober* criticism to suppose that any "copyist," however illiterate, could so far blunder

in writing two words, as not only to confound ἐκ and καὶ, ω and ων, but to alter the true position of the words, putting σχοίνῳ καὶ for ἐκ σχοίνων.

5. The writer is mistaken in supposing that any alteration of the verse is necessary, because λεπτῇ in the feminine gender is joined to παπύρῳ, which he supposes to be masculine only. But if he had consulted the Thesaurus of H. Stephens, the Lexicon of Schneider, or Dr. Maltby's Lexicon Græco-Prosodiacum p. 747., he would have discovered that πάπυρος is both masculine and feminine. Phavor. et Suidas: *Πάπυρος· θηλυκῶς ἡ πάπυρος·*

Λαμπάδα κηροχίτωνα, Κρόνου τυφῆρα λύχνον,
Σχοίνῳ καὶ λεπτῇ σφιγγομένην παπύρῳ.

Let not the writer imagine that these Lexicographers had no other authority for making πάπυρος feminine than this passage of Suidas, and Phavorinus, who, in support of the assertion, adduce the very verse of Antipater, maintained by the writer to be corrupt. Papyrus in Latin also is feminine.

Conseritur bibula Memphitis cymba papyro. Lucan iv. 135.

Succinctus patria quondam, Crispine, papyro. Juvenal iv. 24.

Hoeschel. ad Phrynichum p. 133. quotes two passages from Philo, where the word is feminine: *Εὐτελῆ πάνυ χαμαίστρωτα παπύρου τῆς ἐγχωρίου*, Id. Lib. in Flaccum. p. 666. *Βραχύ τι παπύρου τμῆμα τῆς ἐγχωρίου καὶ ὀδὸν ἐρριμένον ἰδών τις ἀναλίδωσιν*, Ms. Aug. *Ἰδοντες ἀναλιδῶσι*. Dioscorides I. 115.: *Πάπυρος γνώριμός ἐστι πᾶσιν, ἀφ' ἧς ὁ χάρτης κατασκευάζεται.* Theophrastus, however, H. P. iv. 9., writes *ὁ πάπυρος*. It appears that the more ancient writers made the word masculine, while the later writers thought proper to make it feminine.

6. The reviewer is equally mistaken in supposing that his conjecture derives any support from the circumstance "that *βύβλος* is the word usually employed by Greek writers in speaking of the Egyptian plant alluded to," though it must be confessed that Phrynichus Ecl. p. 132 seems to favor the notion: *Πάπειρος* (f. l. *Πάπυρος.*) *τοπάσειεν ἄν τις Αἰγύπτιον εἶναι τοὔνομα, πολὺ γὰρ κατ' Αἴγυπτον πλάζεται, ἡμεῖς δὲ βίβλον ἐροῦμεν.*[1] But still in point of fact πάπυρος is employed quite as often as *βύβλος* by Greek authors when speaking of the said plant. In the passages, to which the writer refers, *βύβλος* is certainly used as synonymous with πάπυρος,

[1] "Gloss.: Πάπειρον· papyrum, scirpus. Male quidem genere neutro. Suidas enim muliebre esse docuit." Nunnesius. But this learned critic is mistaken. For Pliny uses *papyrum* for *papyrus*, and why should not the same liberty be allowed to the Greeks? The passage of Suidas does not militate against the supposition; for Suidas, as we have seen, merely says — *Πάπυρος· θηλυκῶς ἡ πάπυρος*, and then produces the line from Antipater, who has made it feminine. The form, τὸ πάπειρον, therefore merits a place in the new ed. of Stephens' Thesaurus.

but in no one of those passages is βύβλος applied to lamps, as the writer would apply it in the verse of Antipater, and so far as our reading extends, we have not seen a single instance, where it is so used, whereas πάπυρος is frequently mentioned in speaking of them:

Lenta paludigenam vestivit cera papyrum,
Lumine ut accenso dent alimenta simul.
Anthol. Lat. t. ii. p. 462.

Servius in Virg. Æn. i. (731. a Meursio laudatus ad Theocr. Spicileg., Opp. e recensione Lamii, t. v. p. 846. b.:)—"Funalia sunt, quæ intra ceram sunt, atque sunt dicta a funibus, quos ante usum papyri cera circumdatos habuere majores: unde et funera[1] dicuntur, quod funes incensos mortuis præferebant." Cf. Isidori Origg. xx. 10. Veget. ii. 57. 1., Papyrum candelarum purgatam subtiliter carpis, i. qualis ad candelarum ellychnia pro linamentis adhibetur.

7. The writer, after having proposed the strange reading,

——————τυφήρεα λύχνον
ἐκ σχοίνων,

adds, "to make this conjecture probable, let us first observe that these torches were *bundles of small rushes*. Photius: Φανός· λαμπὰς ἡ ἐκ κλημάτων. [οὕτως Μένανδρος:] Ἡανός· δέσμη κληματίδων. [οἱ δὲ νεώτεροι, Ἀττικισταὶ φανόν. Ἀριστοφάνης.]" Now let us for a moment suppose that the reading proposed by the writer is the true reading. We should be glad to be informed what sense he affixes to the word τυφήρεα? If he understands it in the same sense, in which it is understood by Toup and Jacobs, he is unfortunate in the sense of his alteration: τυφήρεα λύχνον, lychnum ἐκ τύφης factum: but, if made ἐκ τύφης, it was not made, as the writer supposes, ἐκ σχοίνων, "Quid sit λύχνος τυφήρης, nemo interpretum explicavit. Intelligendus autem lychnus ἐκ τύφης factus: Ut a κλίνη κλινήρης, sic a τύφη τυφήρης. Est autem τύφη, *herba palustris*, quæ lucernis faciendis inserviebat, de qua Strabo v. p. 246., Τύφη τε, καὶ πάπυρος, ἀνθήλη τε πολλὴ κατακομίζεται ποταμοῖς εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην."

---

[1] The sense of the passage requires *funera*, not *funera*. This derivation of the word *funeræ* differs from another elsewhere proposed by the same Servius "Serv. ad Æn. ix. 486.

——————*nec te tua funera mater*
Produxi:

'Apud majores funeras dicebant eas, ad quas funus pertinet, ut sororem. matrem; nam præficæ sunt planctus principes, non doloris. *Funeras* autem dicebant, quasi funereas.' Hæc Serv. Huc trahunt alii illud Ennii ap. Cic. de Sen. 20., *Nemo me lacrimis decoret, neque funera fletum Faxit.* Ita enim leg. Scalig. et alii. Quæ si vera est lectio, aptius h. l. præficam intelligeres, quam tamen Serv. distinguit a *funera*. Verum hæc omnia incerta sunt, aut obsoleta." Forcellinus.

Toupius in Suid. ii. p. 288. In his MS. notes on Strabo published in Falconer's edition from Toup's Adversaria, Toup repeats his interpretation: "Lychnum e typhe factum; interpr. nugatur." But in saying as he does, "Quid sit λύχνος τυφήρης, nemo interpretum explicavit," he has overlooked the explanation of Suidas, which is adopted by Bod. ad Theophr. p. 430. *Τυφήρεα· τυφωνικήν, fumantem, ardentem.* H. Steph. Thes. iii. 1706. h.: "*Τυφήρης* videtur accipi pro *ardens* vel *fumans*, in hoc ap. Suid. disticho, ubi tamen ipse exponit *τυφωνικήν*." Sed per *τυφωνικὴν* nihil aliud Suidas intelligere potuit, quam *ardentem* vel *fumantem*: ut *τυφάδης πυρετὸς* ap. medicos dicitur febris quædam continua et *ardens*. In this sense therefore the critic will be compelled, in spite of Toup and Jacobs, to take *τυφήρεα*, if he reads

——————— τυφήρεα λύχνον
ἐκ σχοίνων.

The two passages, which he has adduced from Photius, who explains *φανὸς* by *λαμπὰς ἢ ἐκ κλημάτων*, and *πανὸς* by *δέσμη κλη-ματίδων*, cannot be admitted as any proof that these "torches" were *a bundle of small rushes*, and consequently do not afford the smallest protection to his conjectural reading ἐκ σχοίνων. For 1. κλῆμα and κληματίδες are no where used by the Greek authors, when speaking of *rushes*, and 2. Photius has employed these words in a sense wholly misunderstood by the writer. Photius in the gloss on *φανὸς* refers to Menander, and in the gloss on *πανὸς* to Aristoph., and it so happens that Athenæus p. 700. d. has quoted the very passage of Menander:

Πολλῶν οὖν ἐκάστοτε τοιούτων λεγομένων, ἐπεί ποτε ἑσπέρα κατελάμ-βανεν ἡμᾶς, ὁ μέν τις ἔλεγε, παῖ, λύχνειον, οἱ δὲ λυχνέα, οἱ δὲ λοφνίαν· οὕτω καλεῖσθαι, φάσκ[ον]τες, τὴν ἐκ τοῦ φλοιοῦ λαμπάδα· ὁ δὲ, πάνυ· ἄλλος δὲ φανόν· ὁ δὲ λυχνοῦχον· ὁ δὲ λύχνον· καὶ δίμυξον δὲ λύχνον ἕτερος· ἄλλος δὲ ἐλάνην· ὁ δέ τις ἐλάνας, τὰς λαμπάδας οὕτω φάσκων καλεῖσθαι παρὰ τὴν ἔλην· οὕτω δ' ἔφη Νεάνθης ἐν ἀ. τῶν περὶ Ἄτταλον Ἱστοριῶν. καὶ ἄλλος ὅ τι δή ποτε [illegible] πάρμεχον γίνεσθαι οὐ τὸν τυχόντα, τῶν ἐπὶ τούτοις ἱστέων παρὰ πάντων λεγομένων. Σιληνὸν μὲν γάρ τις τὸν γλωσσο-γράφον ἔφασκεν Ἀθηναίους λέγειν τὰς λαμπάδας φανούς. Τιμαχίδας δ' ὁ Ῥόδιος, δέλεαρον τὸν φανὸν καλεῖσθαι, οἷόν φησιν οἱ νυκτερευόμενοι τῶν νέων ἔχουσιν, οὓς οὗτοι ἐλάνας καλοῦσιν. Ἀμειρίας δὲ γράβιον τὸν φανόν. Σέλευκος δὲ οὕτως ἐξηγεῖται ταύτην τὴν λέξιν· "Γράβιον ἐστὶ τὸ πρίνινον ἢ δρύινον ξύλον, ὅπερ ἐθλασμένον καὶ κατεσχισμένον ἐξάπτεσθαι, καὶ φαίνειν τοῖς ὁδοιποροῦσιν. Θεοδωρίδας γοῦν ὁ Συρακούσιος, ἐν Κενταύροις διθυράμβῳ, φησί·

Πίσσα δ' ὑπὸ γραβίων ἔσταζεν, οἷον ἀπὸ λαμπάδων.

μνημονεύει δὲ γραβίων καὶ [Στράττις] ἐν Φοινίσσαις." Ὅτι δὲ λυχνοῦχοι οἱ νῦν καλούμενοι φανοὶ ὠνομάζοντο, Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Αἰολοσίκωνι παρίστησιν·

——————— *Καὶ αστίλβουθ' ὁρῶ,*

ὥσπερ ἐν καινῷ λυχνούχῳ, πάντα τῆς ἐξωμίδος.

——*Ἐν δὲ Θεοφορήτῳ ὁ αὐτὸς Ἀλεξις·*

Οἶμαι [γὰρ] ἐπιτιμᾶν τῶν ἁπαντώντων τινὰς
ἡμῖν, ὅτι τηνικαῦτα μεθύων περιπατῶ.
ποῖος γάρ ἐστι φανὸς, ὦ πρὸς τῶν θεῶν,
τοιοῦτος, οἷος ὁ γλυκύτατος ἥλιος;

Ἀναξανδρίδης δ' ἐν Τύρρει·

Οὐκ ὠκὺ λαβὼν τὸν φανὸν, ἄψεις μοι λύχνον:

Ἄλλοι δ' ἔφασαν, φανὸν λέγεσθαι τὴν λαμπάδα· οἱ δὲ, τὴν ἐκ τινων ξύλων τετμημένην ὕστερον. Μένανδρος Ἀνεψιοῖς·

Ὁ φανός ἐστ, μεστὸς ὕδατος οὑτοσί·
δεῖ τ' οὐχὶ σείειν, ἀλλ' ἀποσείειν αὐτόθεν.

——*Πανὸς δ' ἐνεμάξεται τὸ διακεκομμένον ξύλον, καὶ συνδεδεμένον· τούτῳ δ' ἐχρῶντο λαμπάδι. Μένανδρος Ἀνεψιοῖς*

——————————*Εἰσιόν·*

παγκάλον, λύχνον, λυχνοῦχον, ὅτι πάρεστι φῶς.
μόνον, πολὺ ποιεῖ.

Δίφιλος, Στρατιώτῃ,

Ἀλλ' ὁ πανὸς ὕδατός ἐστι μεστός.

Πρότερος δὲ τούτων Αἰσχύλος ἐν Ἀγαμέμνονι μέμνηται τοῦ πανοῦ. Athen. xv. p. 700.

Athenæus here says that the word φανὸς was, like λυχνοῦχος and λυχνίον, in his time used to signify *laterna*, though it formerly had the sense of *lampas*. Thom. Mag. p. 883.: *Φανός· ἐπὶ λαμπάδος. ἀλλὰ μὴ ἐπὶ κερατίνου λέγε, τοῦτο δὲ λυχνοῦχον.* "Sunt ipsa Phrynichi verba p. 18. ubi v. Nunnes. Photius: *Λυχνοῦχον· τὸν κερατινὸν φανὸν, ἀπὸ τοῦ λύχνου ἐν αὐτῷ περιέγεσθαι. φανὸς δὲ ἡ ἐκ ξύλων λαμπάς. Φιλιππίδης. ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ἐκ τῶν καθαρῶν καὶ διαφανῶν βερμάτων λαμπτῆρες καὶ κεραμίδι διατετρημένοι, [ὥστε διαφαίνειν.] οὕτως Ἀριστοφάνης.*' On this difference between the ancient and the modern use of φανὸς, see Nunnes. ad Phrynichum p. 18. ed. Pauw, Valck. ad Ammon. ii. 16., Schleusneri Lex. Gr. Lat. in N. T., Wetstein. ad Jo. xviii. 3. who says—"*Φανὸς* antiquis facem, recentioribus laternam significat, quæ differunt, ut candela et candelabrum. Glossarium: Laterna. *φανός.* Candela. *φανός.*" H. Stephens Thes. t. iv. 14. g. is mistaken in supposing that the proper and primary signification of the word is *laterna*, which signification, as we have seen, it never bears in the older Greek authors, but only in such as wrote about the time of Athenæus, or in still more recent times. Hence we have no hesitation in saying, that the word first acquired this new meaning among the Alexandrian Greeks. "*Φανὸς*, substantivum," says H. Steph. l.c. "unde Gallicam vocem *falot* quasi *fanot*,[1] laternæ, lampas, fax. Sed

[1] "Sunt qui putent Gallicam vocem *fallot*, esse detortam a φανὸς, quasi fiendum sit *fanot*. Non habent ejus sententiæ auctores me adstipulatorem.

MAGIS PROPRIE reddi existimatur laterna, præsertim quum Jo. xviii. 3. ad voc. φανῶν addatur λαμπάδων. Pollux certe itidemque Hesych. testantur λυχνοῦχον appellasse Atticos, quem ipsi vocarent φανόν." But Hesych. and Pollux vi. 103. et x. 116, 117. are speaking not of the proper and ancient signification of the word φανὸς, to denote a *torch*, but of its improper and modern application to signify a *lantern*. At the same time it must be observed that H. Steph. is quite correct in thinking that φανῶν in the passage of St. John, where it is joined with λαμπάδων, signifies a *lantern*; for, as we learn from Athenæus, Hesychius, J. Pollux, etc. that φανὸς signifies in modern writers a *lantern*, how is it possible to suppose that St. John has employed it to denote a *lamp* or *torch*, when the signification must have been quite obsolete in his time? This remark deserves the notice of the biblical student, who will not in this instance find in Schleusner's Lexicon that accuracy and discrimination, which he usually displays. "Φανὸς," says he, "lucerna, fax, tæda, laterna, lampas. Jo. xviii. 3. ἔρχεται ἐκεῖ μετὰ φανῶν καὶ λαμπάδων, venit eo cum facibus et funalibus." He should rather have said "cum laternis et tædis s. funalibus." ("Λαμπὰς," says Schweigh., "est generale nomen, quod cum de funali, tum de tæda dicitur," ad Athen. xv. 700. b.) His mistranslation is the more remarkable, because he afterwards mentions the difference between the ancient and the modern use of the term. It is worth observation that Dionys. Halic. ix. 720. has joined the two words φανὸς and λαμπὰς, as St. John does: Ἐξέτρεχον ἅπαντες ἐκ τῶν σκηνῶν ἀθρόοι, φανοὺς ἔχοντες καὶ λαμπάδας.

This word φανὸς or πανὸς, besides the two significations just mentioned, in the judgment of Schweighaeuser[1] bears another sense. Photius: Πανός· δέσμη κληματίδων. Athen. l. c.: "Ἄλλοι δὲ ἔφασκον, φανὸν λέγεσθαι τὴν λαμπάδα, οἱ δὲ τὴν ἐκ τινων ξύλων τετμημένων δέσμην, i. e. ex ligno viridi, sarmentis, ἐκ κληματίδων factum fasciculum. Eustath. ad Il. τ. p. 1189=1258, 22=40: Ἱστέον δὲ ὅτι τὸ παρ' Ὁμήρῳ σέλας πυρὸς, ἤτοι πυρσὸν, φανὸν οἱ νεώτεροι εἶπον Ἀττικοί· ὁ δ' αὐτὸς καὶ πανός· ἀπὸ τοῦ φαίνειν σχηματισθείς φασι κατὰ

Nam laternæ illæ, quæ hærent tereti ligno et sublimes sursum feruntur, lingua nostra *fallots* vocantur, fortassis quia velut Phalli vel etiam Ithyphalli, ab imitatione gestationis illius Orthophallicæ, ut nomen ipsum prodit. Quin φάλαι speculæ sunt et loca celsa. Hesych.: φάλαι, ὄρη σκαπτικά, sic enim lego, non ut mendose illic legitur ὄρια σκάπτει." Flor. Christ. ad Aristoph. Pac. 849.

[1] Schweighaeuser's words are these—"Ἄλλοι δὲ ἔφασκον, φανὸν λέγεσθαι τὴν λαμπάδα, οἱ δὲ τὴν ἐκ τινων ξύλων τετμημένων δέσμην. Prior interpretatio jam p. 699. e. ex Sileno Glossographo prolata erat. Est autem λαμπὰς generale nomen, quod cum de funali, tum de tæda dicitur. Altera interpretatio paulo post (lit. d.) ubi de synonymo voc. πανὸς agitur, his verbis repetitur: Πανὸς δ' ὀνομάζεται τὸ διακεκομμένον ξύλον καὶ συνδεδεμένον."

μεταβολὴν τοῦ Φ. ὅιον,' Πανοῦχον ἄξαντες φλόγα· ἣν δέ φασι, δέσμη κληματίδων ὁ πανὸς, καὶ Ἀττικῶς φανός· ὃν δ' ἡμεῖς φανὸν, λαμπτῆρα οἱ παλαιοὶ ἔλεγον. Eustath. ad Od. α. p. 1427=70. 44=22.: Οἱ δὲ παλαιοί φασι καὶ ὅτι δηλ. ἡ ἐκ δάδων λαμπάς· φανὸς δὲ ἡ τῶν κληματίδων, ἡ καὶ πανὸς ἐλέγετο καθὰ ἐν ἄλλοις δεδήλωται. But that Schweighaeuser is, with the unknown Grammarians cited by Athenæus, mistaken in thinking so, is apparent not only from the following words of the same Athenæus, Πανὸς δ' ὀνομάζεται τὸ διακεκομμένον ξύλον καὶ συνδεδεμένον, τούτῳ δ' ἐχρῶντο λαμπάδι: but from Eustath. ad Od. η. p. 1571. 11. (who borrowed his information from Athenæus himself:) Ἔστι δὲ φασι φανὸς, ἡ ἐκ ξύλων τετμημένων δέσμη, καὶ δηλοῖ αὐτὸ Φιλιππίδης ἐν τῷ,

(*A.*) Ὁ φανὸς ἡμῖν οὐκ ἔφαινεν, οὐδὲ ἕν.

(*B*) Ἔπειτα φυσᾷν, δυστυχὴς, οὐκ ἠδύνω.

——δοκεῖ δὲ τῶν εἰς Φανὸν τεμνομένων ξύλων ἓν εἶναι καὶ τὸ καλούμενον γράβιον, πρίνινον αὐτό φασιν ἢ δρύϊνον ξύλον, ὃ ἐκλασμένον ἢ κατεσχισμένον ἐξάπτεται καὶ φαίνει τοῖς ὁδοιποροῦσι· μή ποτε δὲ ἄρα δάδων εἶδός τι καὶ τὸ τοιοῦτον γράβιον, εἴγε πίσσαν καταστάζειν ἔχει, ὡς δηλοῖ Θεοδωρίδας ὁ Συρακούσιος ἐν τῷ,

Πίσσα δ' ὑπὸ γραβίων ἔσταξεν, [ὅιον ἀπὸ λαμπάδων.]—τὴν δὲ ἐκ ξύλων τετμημένων σύνθεσιν τοῦ, εἴτε φανοῦ εἴτε λύχνου, δηλοῖ φασι καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν τῷ,

——Τῶν δ' ἀκοντίων
συνδοῦντες ὀρθὰ τρία, λυχνίῳ (λυχνείῳ) χρώμεθα,
ἤγουν λυχνίᾳ· τὴν γὰρ νῦν φασι λυχνίαν, λυχνοῦν ἐκάλουν, ὡς Φερεκράτης.

Thus it plainly appears that γράβιον was a thick bit of wood splintered at the top into small pieces, which were probably not separated from the main stem, but fastened together in a bundle, so as to be strictly what Athenæus says, ξύλον διακεκομμένον καὶ συνδεδεμένον, and that it served the purpose of a lamp, i. e. φανός. Etym. M. p. 239. 28.: Γραβδὶς· ἡ λαμπὰς, παρὰ τὸ γράφω τὸ ξύω, ἡ κατεξυσμένη καὶ διεσχισμένη· ἢ παρὰ τὸ γράφεσθαι τὸ ξέεσθαι, γραβδὶς ἡ κατεξεσμένη λαμπάς. "Erant quondam in usu ligna inspicata pro facibus, Græcia proprio nomine γράβια dixit." Casaub. "Id est," adds Schweigh., "in summa parte minutas in virgulas incisa, spicarum vel aristarum instar, quo facilius ignem conciperent." Virg. Georg. i. 292.

Ferroque faces inspicat acuto.

Servius: "Acuto ferro incidit ad speciem et imaginem aristarum." Seleucus, quoted by Athenæus and Eustath., says that the wood selected for this purpose was the quercus or ilex. "Imperitus fuisse videtur ille Grammaticus, qui ex ilice aut quercu confieri

---

[1] This is evidently a fragment of some dramatic poet. But for ἄξαντες read ἀψαντες. Πανοῦχος, ut λυχνοῦχος. The word πανοῦχος may be added to the Lexicons of H. Stephens and Schneider.

tædas et faces existimavit. In nostris certe terris arbores illæ ad hunc usum parum fuerint idoneæ." Schweigh. Let us then acquiesce in the opinion of Casaubon: "Existimo sane, grabia factitata de ligno alicujus arborum earum, quæ picem ferunt; cujusmodi sunt in Europa pinus, pinaster, picea, abies, larix, et quæ proprie dicitur tæda." This opinion is greatly confirmed by the verse of Theodoridas quoted by Athen.

Πίσσα δ' ὑπὸ γραβίων ἔσταζε.

From this verse Eustath. rightly infers that the γράβιον was a genus δάδων. Green and sappy wood was preferred. Eustath. ad Od. η. p. 1571. 19: Πανοῦ δέ φασι χρῆσις καὶ παρὰ Διφίλῳ, οἷον,

Ἀλλ' ὁ πανὸς ὕδατός ἐστι μεστός.

Ἥτοι ὁ φανὸς ξύλα ἔχει χλωρότατα καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὑδατηρά.

We have above defined the γράβιον or φανὸς to be a thick bit of wood splintered at the top into small pieces fastened together in a bundle. But sometimes it was composed of small twigs tied together, so as to be strictly what Photius and Eustath. call it, δέσμη κληματίδων. Thus Nicander Colophonius ap. Athen. p. 701. a. and Eustath. l. c. define ἐλάνην, a species of lamp, τὴν τῶν καλάμων δέσμην. Now, if we suppose, as we may do without any violation of probability, that these twigs were sometimes cut from the quercus or ilex, and smeared with pitch,[1] instead of being cut from such trees as yield pitch, we shall be able satisfactorily to vindicate from the charge of absurdity or ignorance the grammarian Seleucus, who defines γράβιον τὸ πρίνινον ἢ δρύϊνον ξύλον.

Thus we see how strangely the critic who supposes from the words of Photius, Φανός· λαμπὰς ἡ ἐκ κλημάτων, Πανός· δέσμη κληματίδων, that "these torches were bundles of small rushes," has fallen into an error.

8. The critic says, as we have seen, with a view to establish his conjectural alteration of παπύρῳ into βύβλῳ in the verse of Antipater, that "βύβλος is the word usually employed by Greek authors in speaking of the Egyptian plant alluded to." But he has fallen into the mistake, which H. Stephens (whose words will be produced below), and Sturzius *de Dial. Maced. et Alexandr.* p. 93. have committed. For Salmasius in Solin. p. 705—6. tells us that the material employed for the wick of these lamps was not made from "the Egyptian plant alluded to," but from the "papyrus altera, Italiæ Græciæque familiaris," Sagittaria Linnæi, s. φλέως, i. e. scirpus, qui naturam papyraceam habet. "Ubicunque

[1] "Tæda, quæ ex lignis diversis confecta erat, et quæ *vel naturali pinguedine, vel oleo piceque illita*, faculæ modo lucebat, Græcis πανὸς et γράβιον dicebatur," says Bodæus ad Theophr. p. 169. b. He then quotes the passage from Athenæus.

papyrus pro charta sumitur apud auctores, ibi de Ægyptia papyro intelligi par est, ast ubi papyrus in candelis ad lumina et funera usui esse memoratur, de communi papyro h. e. scirpo sumere debemus. Clare Plinius de scirpis: *E quibus detracto cortice candelæ luminibus et funeribus serviunt.* Epigr. Antipatri,

Λαμπάδα κηροχίτωνα, Κρόνου τυφήρεα λύχνον,
Σχοίνῳ καὶ λεπτῇ σφιγγόμενον παπύρῳ.

Scirpum intelligit παπύρου nomine i. e. τὸν φλοῦν. Paulinus:

Lumina ceratis adolentur odora papyris,

i. e. candelæ e scirpis factæ. Hinc glossæ scirpum etiam πάπυρον exponunt. Quamvis enim papyrus sit Nilotica proprie planta, a similitudine tamen et usu scirpum, h. e. φλοῦν hoc quoque nomine impertierunt. Strabo v. Τύφη τε καὶ πάπυρος ἀνθήλη τε πολλὴ κατακομίζεται ποταμοῖς εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην. Ubi πάπυρος i. e. quod antiqui Attici φλεὼ dixere, Ionici φλοῦν, qui ἀνθήλην etiam habet, i. e. panniculam et lanuginem." Salm. l. c. "Altera significatio papyri," says Bod. ad Theophr. p. 429., "est, qua Latinis extimus summusque scapus papyri cortex instar scirpi lenis glaberque venit. Plin. xiii. 12.: *Post hanc papyrum est extremumque ejus scirpo simile, ac ne ad funes quidem, nisi in humore utile.*" "At alio loco, de scirpo dixit Plin." adds Salmasius, "in interiore parte mundum papyrum usui dare, idque pro maximo videri debere. Interiorem partem scirpi non vocat, quæ medulla est, sed interiorem corticis partem, quæ mundi papyri usum præbet." H. Stephens, Thes. Ind. v. *πάπυρος*, who, as we have just shewn, errs in supposing that Antipater is speaking of the Egyptian papyrus, says:—"Non tantum planta πάπυρος nominatur, sed etiam ἡ βίβλος, liber ejus, ex quo τὰ βιβλία, ut in Epigr. λαμπάδα κηροχίτωνα Σχοίνῳ καὶ λεπτῇ σφιγγομένην παπύρῳ." Jacobs, Animadv. ad Anthol. t. viii. 295.:—"Verba λεπτῇ παπύρῳ accipienda sunt de scirpi cortice, e quo candelæ fiebant." But this papyraceous matter was obtained, as Salmasius tells us, from the *inner* bark (termed by Pliny xxiv. 8. *corticis interior tilia*), not from the *outer* bark.

9. The writer by substituting βύβλῳ for παπύρῳ has committed the mistake of rejecting the more recondite term παπύρῳ, as if it could be the gloss of what he *himself* thinks the more common term βύβλῳ, thus violating the great critical canon about various lections, that the more rare word is to be preferred. Phrynichus Ecl. p. 132.: Πάπειρος· τοπάζειεν ἄν τις Αἰγύπτιον εἶναι τοὔνομα· πολὺ γὰρ κατ' Αἴγυπτον πλάζεται (πλάττεται, Pauw), ἡμεῖς δὲ βίβλον (βύβλον) ἐροῦμεν. "Πάπειρος cum ει," Pauw, "nullibi offendo, præterquam hic." "Ubicunque," says Sturz. de Dial. Maced. et Alex. p. 98., "hæc planta aut charta inde confecta memoratur, πάπυρος scribitur, non πάπειρος." The form πάπειρος is probably

owing to the negligence of the transcribers, or else to their conceit in wishing by the diphthong *ει* to distinguish the Egyptian plant *πάπειρος* from *πάπυρος φλέως*. A similar conceit induced some ancient grammarians to distinguish *λωτὸς arbor, herba,* from *λωτὸς, tibia,* by writing the word, when used to denote *tibia,* with an *ο, λοτός*. We have another instance of such conceit in their distinction between *θώρηξις, loricatio,* and *θόρηξις, potatio.* See Eustath., whose words are quoted by Mr. Barker in the *Epist. crit. ad Schaeferum,* inserted in *Class. Journ. XXVIII.* 300-4.

10. The critic quotes the following passage from Photius: *Φίλυρα· φυτὸν ἔχον φλοιὸν βύβλῳ παπύρῳ ὅμοιον, ἐξ οὗ τοὺς στεφάνους πλέκουσι.* Eadem glossa totidem literis exstat in Phavorino et Etym. M. p. 795, 4. Suidas, pro *φυτὸν,* habet *εἶδος δένδρου.* "Kuster on Suidas," says the writer, "proposes *βύβλῳ ἢ παπύρῳ.* But the words are synonymous. It is evident that *παπύρῳ* was the explanation of some copyist." But, if the writer had read the note of Schleusner on Photius, or that of Tittmann on Zonaras, he would doubtless have renounced his conjecture. "Legendum est," says Schleusner, "*βίβλῳ παπύρου,* ut est ap. Zonaram Lex. col. 1810.: *Φίλυρα· φυτὸν ἔχον φλοιὸν βίβλῳ παπύρου ὅμοιον.*" "Sic igitur legendum etiam ap. Suidam pro *βίβλῳ* [*βύβλῳ*] *παπύρῳ,* uti etiam in Codd. A. D. Ibi non satis apte Kusterus legit *βίβλῳ ἢ παπύρῳ.* Eodem modo corrige Etym. M." Tittmann. That neither the conjecture of Kuster, nor that of the writer can be admitted to be the true reading, is plain from this circumstance, that the sense of the passage would in the one case require it to stand thus, *Φίλυρα· φυτὸν ἔχον φλοιὸν τῷ τῆς βύβλου ἢ παπύρου φλοιῷ ὅμοιον,* and in the other case thus, *Φ φ. ἔ. φλοιὸν τῷ τῆς βύβλου φλοιῷ ὅμοιον.* The true reading is without doubt that which is found in Zonaras: *Φίλυρα· φυτὸν ἔχον φλοιὸν βίβλῳ παπύρου ὅμοιον.* For, from the resemblance between the bark of the *φίλυρα,* i. e. tilia, and the cortex of the Egyptian papyrus, *φίλυρα* is often used to denote "tennissimas papyri membranas, ex quibus charta fit." The word *philyra* properly signifies the tree, which in Latin is called tilia. (See Theophr. H. P. iii. 10.) But it is metaphorically used to denote membranam tenuissimam inter corticem et lignum tiliæ. Plin. xvi. 14.: "Inter corticem et lignum tenues tunicæ multiplici membrana, e quibus vincula tiliæ vocantur: tennissimæ earum philyræ, coronarum lemniscis celebres, antiquorum honore." It is, besides, sometimes employed to signify "papyri tenuissimas membranas, ex quibus charta fit." Plin. xiii. 11.: "Præparantur ex papyro chartæ, diviso acu in prætenues, sed quam latissimas philuras." Bodæus ad Theophr. p. 179. endeavours to defend the lection *βύβλῳ παπύρῳ* by saying—"*Βύβλος πάπυρος* ad differentiam alterius alicujus papyri." But he would have done well to pro-

duce some other passage, where the two words are joined together in the same manner. The passage therefore, quoted by the writer as one where he supposes the very same accident to have happened as in the Epigram of Antipater, "the intrusion of the gloss," παπύρῳ for the true reading βύβλῳ, is nothing to the purpose.

11. The writer applies the term "torch" to the λαμπὰς described by Antipater,

Λαμπάδα κηροχίτωνα, Κρόνου τυφήρεα λύχνον,
Σχοίνῳ καὶ λεπτῇ σφιγγομένην παπύρῳ.

Now, though we admit that λαμπὰς is, as Schweighaeuser l. c. says, "generale nomen, quod cum de funali, tum de tæda dicitur,"[1] yet we are prepared to maintain that the term *torch* or *flambeau*, i. e. *tæda*, s. *fax*, is inapplicable to the λαμπὰς κηροχίτων, s. τυφήρης λύχνος of Antipater, i. e. *funale*, whose wick, *papyrum*, was surrounded with wax. See the passage from Meursius's Spicilegium quoted above.

12. From what has been already said, it is manifest that not only there is nothing sound or solid in any one of the arguments advanced by the learned critic to support his conjectural alteration of παπύρῳ into βύβλῳ in the verse of Antipater, but that he has in the course of those arguments committed several mistakes by no means of a trivial nature.

13. Now in favor of the reading παπύρῳ, we have not only the testimony of the MSS. and of Suidas in *two* places of his Lexicon, v. πάπυρος, and v. τυφήρεα, but the still more decisive testimony of Moeris Atticista, who in p. 311. says:

Πάπυρος, μακρῶς, Ἀττικῶς· βραχέως, Ἑλληνικῶς.

"Secundam in πάπυρος," says the judicious Pierson, "Atticorum more, produxit Anacreon Od. iv. 5. Ὁ δ' Ἔρως χιτῶνα δῆσας, Ὑπὲρ αὐχένος παπύρῳ. Corripuit Antipater Anthol. vi. C. 10. Ep. 3.

Σχοίνῳ καὶ λεπτῇ σφιγγόμενον παπύρῳ."

It is very surprising that this important passage in Moeris should have escaped the notice both of Dr. Maltby and of the writer, especially as it has been referred to by Jacobs, when commenting on the verse of Antipater.

14. Before we conclude this article, let us confess that we are somewhat puzzled to explain the meaning of σφιγγομένην in the verse of Antipater. How can the λαμπὰς be said σφίγγεσθαι παπύρῳ, when the papyrus formed the wick, and was surrounded

---

[1] Lampadibus densum rapuit funale coruscis. Ovid. Met. xii. 247.
Undique collucent præcinctæ lampades auro. Ovid. Heroid. Ep. xiv. 25.
——— Gravem nodis pinguique bitumine quassant
Lampada. Val. Flacc. iii. 124.
Glossæ: Λαμπάδιον *facula, funale.*

with the cera? Are we to suppose any corruption in the text, or to remove the difficulty by saying that the poet by a poetical licence speaks of the λαμπὰς being σφιγγομένη παπύρῳ, when he really means to say that the wick was twisted together within itself, and the whole surrounded with wax? or shall we say that the papyrum or wick was twisted round a stem of wood, and then itself surrounded with wax, so as to be in fact λαμπάδα κηροχίτωνα σχοίνῳ καὶ λεπτῇ σφιγγομένην παπύρῳ? We propose this as a conjecture, which, if not the right solution of the difficulty, may perhaps guide others in discovering it.

DE GRÆCIS NOVI TESTAMENTI ACCENTIBUS.

1.

Accentus ab Hebræis dicuntur מְעַמִּים h. e. sapores, quod oratio sine iis insulsa videatur, et inconcinna: unde liquet, notitiam eorum ad exquisitam Græcarum dictionum pronuntiationem esse admodum necessariam.

2. Et sacræ N. T. tabulæ, ab ipsis Apostolis Græce exaratæ, tanti a nobis fieri debent, ut vel minima ejus punctula non prætereunda esse merito statuamus.

3. Nonnulli nimis oscitanter et mendose Græca ediderunt, quorum incuria a Christiano magistratu fuisset coercenda. Reip. enim Christianæ maxime interest, ut Græcus N. T. textus quam emendatissimis describatur typis. Viri doctissimi et Græcarum literarum peritissimi vel ab ultimis terris, liberalissimis principum sumtibus essent evocandi, qui tam præclaro præessent operi. Judæi, sanctorum Patriarcharum posteri, præposteri, et fæces sanctæ illius gentis, hic proh dolor sua nos vincunt industria, nulli operæ, nullis parcentes sumtibus.

4. *Accentus Græce dicitur* προσῳδία ex πρὸς, ad, et ᾠδὴ, cantus; *quod accentu vox veluti accinatur:* item τόνος, ου, ὁ, *vocis intentio*, a verbo τείνω, *tendo*. F. τενῶ. P. τέτακα. Præt. pass. τέταμαι. Præt. med. τέτονα.

5. *Sunt vero accentus tres, acutus´, gravis`, circumflexus˜*: Gr. προσῳδία ὀξεῖα, βαρεῖα καὶ περισπωμένη.

6. *Accentus tres occupat sedes, nempe syllabam ultimam, penultimam et antepenultimam* (τὴν λήγουσαν, παραλήγουσαν ἢ προπαραλήγουσαν:) *ut* Apoc. xvii. 14. *Κύριος Κυρίων ἐστί. Gravis afficit solam ultimam.* Joh. vii. 24. *Μὴ κατ' ὄψιν κρίνετε.* Hic in μὴ est accentus gravis.

7. *Circumflexus vero locum habet in sola ultima et penultima: ut* Eph. i. 23. ἥτις ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ. Hic in ἐστὶ τὸ sunt duo graves: in σῶμα αὐτοῦ sunt duo circumflexi. Prov. viii. 17. τοὺς ἐμὲ φιλοῦντας ἀγαπῶ, *diligentes me diligo.*

8. Excipe hic οὔτινος, cujusdam, ἄττινι, cuidam, οἵστισι, quibusdam *etc.* quæ perinde ac si non essent composita, accentum retinent articulorum οὗ, ᾧ, οἷς, etc. Sic. τοῖσδεσι, et τοῖσδεσσι pro τοῖσδε.

9. *Vocabulum accentu* acuto *in fine notatum vocatur* ὀξύτονον (ex. ὀξὺς, εἶα, ὺ, acutus, et τόνος, intentio:) in penultima παροξύτονον, Latine *penacutum;* in antepenultima προπαροξύτονον. Vocabulum gravi in fine notatum vocatur βαρύτονον (ex Βαρὺς, εἶα, ὺ, *gravis, e.*)

10. *Vocabulum, quod in ultima circumflexum habet, dicitur* περισπώμενον (pro περισπαόμενον, a σπάω, ῶ *traho, flecto:* περισπάω, *circumflecto:*) *quod in penultima,* προπερισπώμενον.

11. *Omnis* acutus *in fine vocis fit* gravis *in orationis contextu. Quod ipsum quoque in pronuntiatione non est negligendum:* ut Rom. ii. 16. Θεὸς κρινεῖ τὰ κρυπτὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, *deus judicabit occulta hominum.* Hic ultima Θεὸς, item τὰ κρυπτὰ, non sunt acute proferenda, ita tamen, ut syllaba, in qua est accentus, præ aliis audiatur. E contrario Joh. xx. 28. ὁ Θεός μου, *deus meus.* Hic ultima in Θεὸς est acute et elate enuntianda.

12. *Quamvis vero omnis* acutus *in fine vocis, in ipsa orationis serie abeat in gravem, tamen in fine sententiæ manet acutus:* ut 1 Thessal. iv. 5. καθάπερ τὰ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ εἰδότα τὸν Θεὸν, *Sicut gentes, quæ non noverunt deum.* Hic ultima in Θεὸν, est acute proferenda.

13. *Accentus ergo* gravis *est* acuti *vicarius in contextu, nec eum extra orationis seriem uspiam offenderis.* Latiori sensu *omnis syllaba in fine, quæ non* acuto *aut* circumflexo *notata est, dicitur* barytona. *Hinc* τύπτω, *Grammaticis est conjugationis barytonæ, quia ultima* gravi *accentu non scripto affecta judicatur.*

14. *Sicut Latini in accentibus penultimæ syllabæ, ita Græci ultimæ habere solent rationem.* Sic Græce εἴδωλον, Latine *idolum:* Græce παράσιτος, Latine *parasitus.* Græce εἰκόνες, Latine *icones.* Græce φιλοσοφία. Latine *Philosophia.* Græce θεόλογος, Latine *Theologus.* Græce ναύκληρος, Latine *nauclerus.* Græce ἐκκλησία, Latine *Ecclesia.* Græce παράκλητος, Latine *paraclétus.*

15. *Dictio Græca unum natura habet accentum. Si itaque in serie orationis duo occurrunt, unus est geminus, alter adventitius.*

16. *Voculæ tamen* ἄτονοι *sunt* εἰ, εἰς, ἐν, ὁ, ἡ, οἱ, αἱ, ὡς, οὐ, οὐκ, οὐχί, ἐκ, ἐξ.

17. *At in fine cujuscunque distinctionis* οὐ, *accentu acuto notatur: ut* Matth. xiii. 29. ὁ δὲ ἔφη, οὔ, *ille vero dixit, non.* Hic οὔ in fine coli acuitur. Joh. xxi. 5. ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ, οὔ, *responderunt ei, non.* Ex. xviii. 7. εἰ ἔστι Κύριος ἐν ἡμῖν ἢ οὔ, *est ne*

dominus inter nos, an non? Hic ἔστι post εἰ accentum habet in prima, v. infra num. 133.

De singulorum vero accentuum sedibus sequentes regulæ notentur:

18. *Dictio monosyllaba contracta circumflectitur:* ut φῶς, pro φάος, lumen: νοῦς, pro νόος, mens: γῆ, pro γέα, terra. Sic σπῶ, ex σπάω, traho: πνεῖ, pro πνέει, flat: μοῦ, pro μέο, mei. *Monosyllaba brevis vel etiam longa, non contracta, acuitur:* ut ἅς, qui: ἅλς, sal: μή, ne. At νῦν, nunc, περισπᾶται, et δᾳὶς, tæda, fax, contract. pro δαΐς, ὀξύνεται.

19. *Etiam polysyllaba circumflectunt syllabam contractam:* ut συκῆ, pro συκέη, ficus. Luc. xiii. 7.: ἡμῶν, pro ἡμέων, nostri: ἡμεῖς, pro ἡμέες, nos: ἐμοῦ, pro ἐμέο, mei, ut Ionismus demonstrat: ἀγαπῶ, pro ἀγαπάω. 1 Joh. iv. xxi. ὁ ἀγαπῶν (pro ἀγαπάων) τὸν Θεὸν, ἀγαπᾷ (pro ἀγαπάει) καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, *qui diligit deum, diligit etiam fratrem suum.* At Ephes. v. 33. in ἀγαπάτω, pro ἀγαπαέτω, etiamsi κρᾶσις sit, α non circumflectitur ob ultimam longam.

20. *Dissyllaba priorem natura longam* (si totum habeant) *sequente brevi circumflectunt: ut* σῶμα, corpus: ἧλος, clavus: οἶκος, domus: γλῶσσα, lingua: τεῖχος, murus: κρῖνε, judica: εἶδον, vidi: οἶδα, novi.

21. *Quædam etiam ἀνωμάλως circumflectunt penultimam longa sequente:* ut χοῖνιξ, chœnix. Apoc. vi. 6.: αὖλαξ, sulcus: φῆλιξ, Felix. Act. xxiv. 3. At κήρυξ, præco 1 Tim. ii. 7.: θώραξ, thorax etc. regulam sequuntur.

22. *In polysyllabis ultima existente longa acuitur penultima, cum brevis est, antepenultima:* ut Act. v. 4. οὐκ ἐψεύσω ἀνθρώποις, non mentitus es hominibus. Matth. xxvii. 57. ἄνθρωπος πλούσιος, homo dives.

23. *Excipiuntur hic;* (1.) *Genitivi Ionici; ut* Αἰνείεω, pro Αἰνείου. 2.) *Nomina quartæ declin. simplicium, quæ est declinatio Attica:* ut ἵλεως, misericors, propitius in Genitiv. ἵλεω; ἀνίλεως, ω, immisericors. Jac. ii. 13: ἀνώγεων, ω, τὸ, cœnaculum. Luc. xxiii. 12.: ὑπόχρεως, ω, ὁ, debitor: 3.) *Genitivi Attici secundæ declin. contractorum.* Marc. vi. 12. πόλεων, urbium. Rom. xi. 43. γνώσεως, scientiæ: 4.) *Quædam composita quintæ declinat. simplicium:* ut κλαυσίγελως, φιλόγελως, ωτος, ὁ, qui facile ridet, qui facetiis delectatur, etc.: 5.) *item alia nonnulla:* ut ὀλίγος, exiguus: ποικίλος, varius: ἐναντίος, contrarius: νυμφίος, sponsus: σκορπίος, scorpius: omniaque adject. im. αλέος: ut ἀρκαλέος, molestus: πενθαλέος, luctuosus: 6.) *Verbalia in* έος, v. infra. Num. ciii. 7.) *Deminutiva in* ίσκος, ut νεανίσκος, juvenculus: 8.) *Verbalia in* ος *cum nominibus e præterito medio ortis composita, quæ si active capiantur, sunt* παροξύτονα: ut Act. xvii. 18. σπερμολόγος, nugator: 1 Tim. i. 9. ἀνδροφόνος, homicida: Luc. xii. 42. οἰκονόμος, domus altor, qui

pascit seu alit familiam: θεολόγος, ου, ὁ, qui de deo disserit. Sic κληρονόμος, hæres: μογιλάλος, qui vix fari potest.

24. *Sin passive capiuntur, ex regula acuitur antepenultima:*— ut ἰχθυοφάγος, ου, ὁ, ἡ, qui vel quæ pisces edit: ἰχθυόφαγος, ου, ὁ, ἡ, qui vel quæ a piscibus editur. Exceptionem nonnulli observant in Pindar. Olymp. od. vi. p. 109. ubi λαοτρόφος τιμὴ vocatur honor τρεφόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ, nutritus a populo, et alicui tributus vel a populo celebratus. Vide Lexicon Porti p. 321. Alii tamen active accipiunt, et vertunt: *honorem populi altorem.*

25. *Secus se habent verbalia in ος, cum præpositione composita:* ut ἀπόστολος, legatus: κατάσκοπος, explorator, Heb. xi. 31. Sic κατάλογος, enumeratio: διάλογος, colloquium.

26. *Diphthongi finales αι et οι, nulla sequente consona, habentur pro brevibus:* ut Joh. i. 32. τεθέαμαι, vidi: Act. xv. 28. ἐπιτίθεσθαι, imponere: Act. xviii. 15. οἱ ἔμποροι, mercatores.

27. Excipe αι in tertia sing. a. 1 act. optativi; idque ad differentiam a. 1 med. imperativi. V. c. solo accentu differunt:

ποιήσαι, 3 singul. a. 1 opt. *faciat.*

ποιῆσαι, a. 1 act. infinit. *facere.*

ποίησαι, 2 singul. a. 1 med. imperat. *facito.*

Sic adv. οἴκοι, *domi*, ad differentiam nominativi plur. οἶκοι, *ædes:* item tertiæ singularis a. 2 act. opt. εὕροι, non εὗρει, ab εὑρίσκω, invenio.

28. *Particulæ, α, ευ, δυς, δι, ὑμο, ἀρτι, ἀντὶ, ὑπὸ* etc. *compositæ cum nominibus oxytonis, accentum retrahunt:* ut πιστὸς, fidelis: ἄπιστος, infidelis. 1 Cor. vi. 6.: τακτὸς, ordinatus: ἄτακτος, inordinatus. 1 Thess. v. 14.: νοητὸς, sub intelligentiam cadens: δυσνόητος, difficilis intellectu. 1 Pet. iii. 16.: ψυχὴ, anima: δίψυχος, animo duplex. Jac. iv. 8.: ὁμότεχνος, qui est ejusdem artificii. Act. xviii. 3.: ἀντίχριστος, Antichristus: ὕπανδρος, ου, ἡ, quæ viro subjecta est, Rom. vii. 2.

29. *Item adjectiva ex duobus adjectivis composita sunt* πρεσβυγένης: ut σοφὸς, sapiens: φιλόσοφος, sapientiæ studiosus: καλὸς, mundus: φιλόκαλος, munditiei studiosus. At leginus Act. vii. 14. ἑβδομηκονταπέντε: ubi accentus manet in penultima, εὐφωνίας ἕνεκα.

30. *Sic ex duobus substantivis composita:* ναύκληρος, ου, ὁ, navis dominus: δήμαρχος, populi princeps.

31. *Item ex adjectivis et substantivis composita:* ut ἑκατόνταρχος, ου, ὁ, centurio. Luc. vii. 5.: ubi τοῦ εὐφωνίας ἕνεκα iteratur: dicitur enim ἑκατόνταρχος, pro ἑκατόναρχος: ὀλίγωρος, ου, ὁ, ἡ, negligens: ex ὀλίγος, parvus: et ὥρα, ας, ἡ, cura: φιλόστοργος, ex φίλος, deditus, et στοργὴ, ῆς, ἡ, amor imatus, qualis esse solet inter consanguineos: δικάλογος, q. d. δέκα λόγοι, decem verba: θεήλατος, ου, ὁ, ἡ, a deo immissus, pro θεοέλατος; ubi οε mutantur in η.

32. *At composita cum οὐρὸς, οῦ, ὁ,* custos, *sunt ὀξύτονα*: ut οἰκουρὸς, οῦ, ὁ, ἡ, *domûs custos:* πυλωρὸς vel πυλουρὸς, οῦ, ὁ, ἡ, portæ custos, janitor, trix. *Eodem modo se habent composita cum adjectivo* ἀγωγὸς, h. e. alliciendi vi præditus; ut ψυχαγωγὸς, flexanimus: δημαγωγὸς, οῦ, ὁ, qui plebem, quæ est bellua multorum capitum, scit flectere, quo vult: παιδαγωγὸς, pædagogus etc.: *item cum nomine* ἔργον, οῦ, τὸ, opus: ubi ο et contrahuntur in ου: ut ἀγαθουργὸς, pro ἀγαθοεργὸς, beneficus: δημιουργὸς, pro δημιοεργὸς, opifex publicus: θαυματουργὸς, pro θαυματοεργὸς, qui miracula edit: λειτουργὸς, pro λητοεργὸς, publicus magister: συνεργὸς, οῦ, ὁ, collega. 2 Cor. viii. 23.: ὑπουργὸς, pro ὑποεργὸς, adjutor etc. *Excipe duo:* κακοῦργος, pro κακόεργος, scelestus, et πανοῦργος, pro παντοῦργος, quod contractum pro παντόεργος, extrita litera ταῦ, astutus.

33. *Secus se habent cum præpositionibus* παρὰ et περὶ *composita:* ut πάρεργος, præter opus, ad rem non pertinens: περίεργος, curiosus etc. *Sic*

Regulam sequuntur composita ex ἔχω *in* οῦχος, vel οχος: ut ῥαβδοῦχος, ου, ὁ, qui fasces gestat, lictor, q. d. ὁ ἔχων ῥάβδον: ἡνίοχος, ου, ὁ, auriga, q. d. ὁ ἔχων τὴν ἡνίαν, qui habenas capessit.

34. *Nominativi accentus manet in obliquis, nisi regula generalis impediat:* ut στεῖρα, sterilis, q. d. στερρὰ, firma. Luc. i. 5, 7.: Genit. στείρας: Dat. στείρᾳ: Accusat. στεῖραν: Vocat. στεῖρα. Genitivus et Dativus non retinent circumflexum ob ultimam natura longam: προφήτης, propheta: Genit. προφήτου. Luc. iv. 24.: Nom. pl. προφῆται. Luc. x. 24.: ex regula. vide Num. xix. 27.: σῦκον, ου, τὸ, ficus, fructus: in Genit. σύκου, ob ultimam longam: ῥυτὶς, ῥυτίδος, ruga: ὄρνις, ὄρνιθος, avis: παροψὶς, παροψίδος, patina Matth. xxiii. 25.: πέλεκυς, securis, ἀξίνη: in Genit. πελέκεως: σφραγὶς, sigillum, in Genit. σφραγῖδος, ob penultimam natura longam: μεγιστᾶν, ᾶνος: plur. μεγιστᾶνες, proceres: Dat. plur. μεγιστᾶσι. Marc. vi. 21. *Accentus hic semper in eodem manet loco, etsi non idem.*

35. At δεσπότης, herus, in Vocat. δέσποτα, non δεσπότα; prout dicimus ἐπιστάτης, in Vocat. ἐπιστάτα. Luc. v. 5. Sic μία, una, in Genit. μιᾶς. Dat. μιᾷ: οὐδεμία, nulla: οὐδεμιᾶς, οὐδεμιᾷ. Sic ἀνὴρ, vir: δαὴρ, levir, seu mariti frater: σωτὴρ, servator: πατὴρ, pater: in Vocat. ὦ ἄνερ, ὦ σῶτερ, ὦ πάτερ, ὦ δάερ etc. ubi accentus retrahitur. Regulare est μήτηρ, ὦ μῆτερ.

36. *Genitivi et Dativi cujuscunque numeri in declinationibus parisyllabicis ultimam circumflectunt, si in ea accentum habuerint:* ut μαθητὴς, discipulus: Genit. μαθητοῦ: Dat. μαθητῇ: Dual. μαθηταῖν: Genit. plur. μαθητῶν: Dat. μαθηταῖς: τιμὴ, pretium, honor: ῆς, ῇ, αἶν, ῶν, αἷς. Sic ὁδὸς, ὁδοῦ, ὁδῷ: Dual. ὁδοῖν: plur. ὁδῶν, ὁδοῖς.

37. *Excipe Genitivos singulares Atticos quartæ simplicium:* ut Ἀπολλὼς, in Genit. Ἀπολλῶ, nomen viri. 1 Cor. i. 12. Sic νεὼς, templum: Genit. νεῶ.

38. *Ultima Genitivi pluralis in prima et secunda simplicium,*

qualiscunque etiam fuerit nominativi singularis accentus, semper circumflectitur: ut τράπεζα, mensa: Genit. plur. τραπεζῶν: πολίτης, civis: Genit. plur. πολιτῶν: γλῶσσα, lingua: Genit. plur. γλωσσῶν.

39. *Feminina adjectiva secundæ simplicium orta a masculinis tertiæ simplicium, genitivum pluralem similem habent suo masculino:* ut ἅγιος, sanctus, ἁγίων: ἡ ἁγία, sancta, gen. plur. ἁγίων, non ἁγιῶν: sanctarum: Æolice distinctius ἁγιάων: ab οὗτος, αὕτη, Genit. pl. τούτων per omnia genera.

40. *Secus fit in adjectivis fem. gen. quorum masculina sunt quintæ simplicium:* ut πᾶς, omnis: παντός: πᾶσα, πασῶν: ἅπας, simul omnis, ἅπαντος, ἅπασα: in genit. pl. ἁπασῶν: λέγων, dicens, λέγοντος, f. g. λέγουσα: genit. plur. λεγουσῶν.

41. *Quintæ declinationis Genitivi et Dativi dissyllabi accentum sortiuntur in ultima: Nominativi vero, Accusativi et Vocativi dissyllabi in priori:* ut manus, χεῖρ, χειρὸς, χειρὶ, χεῖρα, χεῖ: D. χεῖρε, χειροῖν: P. χεῖρες, χειρῶν, χερσὶ, χείρας, χεῖρες, ubi obiter nota, χεὶρ esse g. f. in sing. et plur. numero: in duali vero Att. q. g. m. τῶ χεῖρε, quia mascula virtus ex robore manuum et lacertorum inprimis apparet.

42. *Eandem accentus rationem fere imitantur etiam alia:* ut ἀνὴρ, pro Genit. ἀνέρος, ἀνδρὸς: Dat. ἀνδρὶ: Accus. ἄνδρα: Vocat. ἄνερ. Pl. ἄνδρες, ἀνδρῶν, ἀνδράσι, ἄνδρας, ἄνδρες. Sic πατὴρ, πατρὸς, πατρὶ, ut in Accus. πατέρα, pro πάτρα, differentiæ causa, ne videatur nomen πάτρα, ας, ἡ, patria. Et μήτηρ, mater, μητρὸς, μητρὶ, ut in Accus. μητέρα, ut distinguatur a nomine μήτρα, ας, ἡ, matrix: γαστὴρ, venter, in Accus. γαστέρα, tantum, ut discriminetur a γάστρα, ας, ἡ, vas amplum, ventricosum. Item γυνὴ, mulier, γυναικὸς, γυναικὶ, γυναῖκα, γύναι. Dual. γυναῖκε, γυναικοῖν: Plur. γυναῖκες, γυναικῶν, γυναιξὶ, γυναῖκας, γυναῖκες. Sic θυγάτηρ, filia, θυγατρὸς, θυγατρὶ, θύγατρα, θύγατερ: Dual. θύγατρε, θυγατροῖν: Plur. θύγατρες, θυγατρῶν, θυγατράσι, θύγατρας, θύγατρες. Homerus; θυγατέρα ἣν filiam suam.

43. *Excipiuntur participia* ὤν, ens, ὄντος, ὄντι, ὄντα, ὦν: Dual. ὄντε, ὄντοιν: Plur. ὄντες, ὄντων, οὖσι, ὄντας, ὄντες. Sic part. a. 2. act. θεὶς, qui posuit, θέντος: στὰς, qui stetit, στάντος: γνοῦς, qui cognovit, γνόντος: δοὺς, qui dedit, δόντος: φὺς, qui natus est, φύντος, etc.

44. *Excipiuntur præterea hi Genitivi plurales:* πάντων, a nomine πᾶς, omnis: παίδων, a παῖς, puer (pro quo quoque παΐδων, dicitur, a παΐς, dialysi poetica:) item φώτων. Jac. i. 17.: a nomine τὸ φῶς, lumen, ut distinguatur a Genit. plural. φωτῶν, a nomine ὁ φὼς, vir: item ὤτων, aurium, ab οὖς, auris, ut discernatur ab ὠτὸς, οῦ, ὁ, quod est nomen avis: λύκον ὤτων κρατῶ, lupum auribus teneo. Prov. Sic Τρώων, δμώων, a nomine Τρῶς, Trojanus, δμῶς, servus: ut discernantur a Genitivis Τρωῶν, δμωῶν, quorum nominativi singulares sunt parisyllabi: Τρωὸς, οῦ, ὁ, Trojanus, δμωὸς, οῦ, ὁ, servus.

Sic πᾶσι, pro πασὶ, omnibus, ne videatur fluxisse a voce πᾶν, πανὸς, Pan, idolum: pl. πάνοι, πανῶν, πασί. Sic κῆρ, τὸ, κέαρ, ατος, τὸ, τοῦ, κῆρος, cor, ad differentiam vocis κὴρ, κηρὸς, ἡ, fatum: ἦρ, ἦρος, τὸ, pro ἔαρ, αρος, τὸ, ver, ob solam contractionem.

45. *Excipitur etiam* τίς; *quis? ἐρωτηματικὸν*, h. e. *interrogativum*, quod sic declinatur:

Sing. τίς, *quis*, τίνος, τίνι, τίνα.
Dual. τίνε, τίνοιν.
Plur. τίνες, τίνων, τίσι, τίνας.

Joh. vi. 67. πρὸς τίνα ἀπελευσόμεθα; ad quemnam abituri essemus? Item quoties τίνος vertitur *cujus* et non *alicujus*, licet non sit interrogativum re ipsa, sed tantum potestate; ut Joh. xix. 24. λάχωμεν περὶ αὐτοῦ, τίνος ἔσται, sortiamur de illa, cujus futura sit. Joh. ii. 25. τί ἦν, quinam esset. Joh. iv. 10. καὶ τίς ἐστιν, et quisnam sit. Joh. vi. 64. τίνες εἰσίν, quinam essent. Luc. ix. 15. τίς τί διεπραγματεύσατο, quis quid negotiando confecisset. Joh. xii. 49. τί εἴπω καὶ τί λαλήσω, quid dicam: et quid loquar.

At τὶς, *aliquis*, *ἀόριστον*, *s. indefinitum sic declinatur:*

Sing. τὶς, τινὸς, τινὶ, τινά.
Dual. τινὲ, τινοῖν.
Plur. τινὲς, τινῶν, τισὶ, τινάς.

46. Sic πῦρ, *ignis*, in nominativo plurali πυρὰ, *ignes*, *incendia*, pro πύρα, idque neglecto discrimine. In caussa est litera ῥῶ, ad quam accentus festinat. Homer. Il. θ, 509, 557, etc. At πυρὰ, ᾶς, ἡ, Ionice ἡ πυρὴ, *pyra*, *rogus ardens*. Il. ψ, 164.

47. *Dicitur etiam* λάων, κράτων, δάδων, quæ contracta sunt ex λαάων, κραάτων, δαΐδων, a nominativis λᾶας, αος, ὁ lapis: κράας, ατος, τὸ, caput: δαὶς, αΐδος, ἡ, fax, a δαίω, uro: quamvis non negem, λᾶς, λαὸς, ὁ, lapis: δᾶς, δαδὸς, ἡ, fax: κρὰς, κρατὸς, τὸ, caput, flecti etiam instar superioris paradigmatis, χεὶρ, χειρός.

48. *Sic* νόος, νοῦς, in Genit. νόου, νοῦ: Dat. νόῳ, νῷ *pro quibus tamen usitatiora sunt* τοῦ νοὸς, τῷ νοΐ; ubi νοῦς in Genit. et Dativo degenerat in familiam nominum quintæ simplicium.

49. *Vocativus in* ες *proprius*, *in* ης *primæ contractorum*, est προπαροξύτονος: ut Σωσθένης, ὦ Σόσθενες, vide supra num. 23. Cetera in ης retinent accentum nominativi, ut εὐσεβὴς, ὦ εὐσεβές.

50. *Substantiva primæ contractorum in* ος *nunquam accentum habent in fine:* ut τέλος, εος, τὸ, finis: στρῆνος, ένος, τὸ, luxus: στῆθος, έος, τὸ, pectus: ῥάκος, εος, τὸ, panniculus: τεῖχος, εος, τὸ, murus: σκεῦος, εος, τὸ, vas. Sic polysyllaba ἔλεος, ἐλέεος, τὸ, misericordia: ὄνειδος, ὀνείδεος, probrum: πέλαγος, πελάγεος, τὸ, profunditas maris: μέγεθος, μεγέθεος, τὸ, magnitudo. Eph. i. 19.

51. *Omnia nomina in* ευς *sunt* ὀξύτονα: ut βασιλεὺς, έος, vel Attice έως, rex: θρησκεὺς, έος, religiosus: ἱερεὺς, έος, ὁ, sacerdos.

52. *Nomina deminutiva in* ιον *accentum primitivorum sequuntur:* ut παιδίον, ου, τὸ, puellulus, oritur a Genit. παιδὸς: ὠτίον, ου,

τὸ, auricula, ab οὖς, ὠτὸς, pro οὐτὸς, auris: ψωμὸς. οῦ, ὁ, unde est ψωμίον, ου, τὸ, offula. Joh. xiv. 26: non dicimus ψώμιον, quia derivatur a ψωμὸς, quod est ὀξύτονον: sic στρουθὸς, οῦ, ὁ, passer: unde est στρουθίον, ου, τὸ, passerculus: κηρὸς, ου, ὁ, cera, κηρίον, ου, τὸ, favus, cellula cerea, in qua apes mellificant, Luc. xxiv. 42: μύριον, ου, τὸ, particula, a μόρος, ου, ὁ, portio: κέρας, ατος, τὸ, cornu, κεράτιον, non κεραΐον, ου, τὸ, siliqua. Luc. xv. 16. κτῆμα, τος, τὸ, possessio. κτημάτιον, non κτηματίον, possessiuncula, a Genit. κτήματος: εἰδύλλιον, ου, τὸ, tenue carmen: item oda; ab εἶδος, εος, τὸ, species. At θυγάτριον, ου, τὸ, filiola. Marc. vii. 25: a nomine θυγάτηρ, in Genit. θυγατρὸς, accentum nominativi sequitur: a βότρυς, υος, ὁ, *uva*, βοτρύδιον, fit pro βοτρύϊον, εὐφωνίας ἕνεκα interposito δέλτα, *uvula*. Es. xviii. 5.

53. *Discrepant pauca;* ut σχοινίον, ου, τὸ, funiculus. Act. vi. 27, 32; a σχοῖνος, ου, ὁ, funis: βιβλίον, ου, τὸ, a βίβλος, ου, ἡ, liber: χωρίον, ου, τὸ, ager, pro χώριον. Act. i. 18. a nomine χῶρος, ου, ὁ, locus: τεκνίον, Gal. iv. 19. a τέκνον, ου, τὸ, proles: νησίον, ου, τὸ, parva insula. Act. xxvii. 16. a νῆσος, ου, ἡ, insula: κράνον, ου, τὸ, caput, κρανίον, ου, τὸ, calvaria: πέδον, ου, τὸ, solum, πεδίον, ου, τὸ, campus: φορτίον, ου, τὸ, onus, a φόρτος, ου, ὁ. Sed obiter hic moneo, *non omnia nomina in* ιον *esse deminutiva*. V. g. δαιμόνιον, ου, τὸ, non est deminutivum, a δαίμονος, ὁ, ut videri posset, sed est ab adjectivo δαιμόνιος, ὁ, ἡ, et subintelligitur πνεῦμα.

54. *Deminutiva in* άριον *sunt* προπαροξύτονα: ut παιδάριον, puellulus: βιβλάριον, libellulus.

55. *Deminutiva in* ίσκος, ίλος, ίων, *sunt penacuta:* ut νεανίσκος, ου, ὁ, adolescentulus: παιδίσκη, ης, ἡ, ancillula: ἀνθρωπίσκος, ου, ὁ, homunculus: ἀστερίσκος, ου, ὁ, stellula, ab ἀστὴρ, έρος, ὁ, stella: ναυτίλος, parvus nauta: μωρίων, ineptulus.

56. *Adjectiva in* εις, εσσα, εν, *sunt in masc. et neutr. gen.* παροξύτονα: ut χαρίεις, εσσα, εν, gratiosus, a, um: σκιόεις, εσσα, εν, umbrosus, a, um.

57. *Adjectiva in* ώδης, *copiam notant, more adjectivorum Latinorum in* osus, *et sunt* παροξύτονα: ut λιθώδης, έος, ὁ, ἡ, lapidosus: θρηνώδης, εος, ὁ, ἡ, luctuosus, a: πετρώδης, εος, ὁ, ἡ, petrosus.

58. *Adjectiva in* ρὸς, ὰ, ὸν, *sunt* ὀξύτονα: ut αἰσχρὸς, ὰ, ὸν, turpis: σκληρὸς, ὰ, ὸν, durus: πονηρὸς, ὰ, ὸν, malignus, a, um. Sic alia adjectiva in ος, ut καλὸς, mundus: σοφὸς, sapiens: κακὸς, malus. At φίλος, amicus, πρᾶος, mitis, ἥσυχος, quietus, ὠφέλιμος, utilis etc. non habent accentum in ultima.

59. *Adjectiva in* αῖος *non solent* ὀξύνεσθαι: ut ἀρχαῖος, αία, αῖον, antiquus: ἑδραῖος, αία, αῖον, stabilis: ἐξαπινάιος, αία, αῖον, repentinus: βίαιος, αία, αῖον, violentus: δικαῖος, αία, αῖον, justus, a, um: βέβαιος, αία, αῖον, firmus. Sic σπουδαῖος, αία, αῖον, studiosus, a, um: ἀναγκαῖος, αία, αῖον, necessarius, a, um.

60. *Excipiuntur perpauca:* παλαιὸς, ὰ, ὸν, antiquus, a, um: κραταιὸς, ὰ, ὸν, robustus: γεραιὸς, ὰ, ὸν, senex.

61. *Gentilia fere omnia ad unum accentum sortiuntur in penultima:* ut Ἀθηναῖος, αία, αῖον, Atheniensis: Ῥωμαῖος, αία, αῖον, Romanensis, vel Romanus, a, um.

62. *Sic se etiam habent in* ος *purum, quæ formant femininum in* α; ut νέος, α, ον, novus: τέλειος, εία, εῖον, perfectus, a, um: αἰώνιος, αἰωνία (Hebr. ix. 12.) αἰώνιον, æternus, a, um: σπάνιος, α, ον, rarus, a, um: οὐράνιος, α, ον, cœlestis, e. Item ἐπίγειος, terrestris: Ἀχίλλειος, Achilleus: Ἀριστοτέλειος, Aristoteleus.

63. *At* ὄγδοος, όη, οον, octavus, a, um, et ὁλοπαθῆ, h. e. *quæ per omnes casus patiuntur* κρᾶσιν, ut ἁπλόος, οῦς, όη, ῆ, όον, οῦν, simplex: item *adjectiva a nominibus metallorum orta*, ut a χρυσὸς, aurum, est χρύσεος, et contracte χρυσοῦς, aureus: a σίδηρος, ου, ὁ, ferrum, est σιδήρεος, contracte σιδηροῦς, ferreus, in f. g. σιδηρέα, contracte σιδηρᾶ. Act. xii. 10. Apoc. ii. 27: idque Dorice: a χαλκὸς, οῦ, ὁ, æs, est χάλκεος, contracte χαλκοῦς, æneus: ab ἄργυρος, ου, ὁ, argentum, est ἀργύρεος, contracte ἀργυροῦς, argenteus: λίνεος, οῦς, έη, ῆ, εον, οῦν, lineus, a, um. Sic πορφύρεος, οῦς, purpureus, πορφυρέη, ῆ, πορφύρεον, contracte πορφυροῦν. Joh. xix. 5. *Obiter hic observetur, quod differre videantur* χρυσὸς, οῦ, ὁ, et χρυσίον, τὸ, quorum illud *aurum*, hoc *aureum* indicat *numum*. Sic ἀργυρος, ου, ὁ, argentum, et ἀργύριον, ου, τὸ, pecunia.

64. *Nomina substantiva in* εῖον *locum notare solent, et circumflectunt penultimam:* ut Λυκεῖον, ου, τὸ, Lyceum: γυναικεῖον, είου, τὸ, gynæceum: παιδοχεῖον, είου, τὸ, diversorium. Luc. x. 34: ταμεῖον, είου, τὸ, conclave. Marc. ii. 9: μουσεῖον, είου, museum.

65. *Item nomina in* ὼν, ῶνος, *locum notant:* ut νυμφὼν, ῶνος, ὁ, sponsi conclave. Marc. ii. 19: ἀμπελὼν, ῶνος, ὁ, vinea: οἰνὼν, ῶνος, ὁ; cella vinaria: ἐλαιὼν, ῶνος, ὁ, olivetum. Act. i. 12: κοιτὼν, ῶνος, ὁ, cubiculum. Act. xii. 20: πυλὼν, ῶνος, ὁ, vestibulum.

66. *Adjectiva in* ης *non contracta sunt* ὀξύτονα: ut ἀληθὴς, έος, ὁ, ἡ, verus, a. in n. g. τὸ ἀληθὲς, verum: ψευδὴς, έος, ὁ, ἡ, falsus, a etc. *Item composita in* ης: ut εὐσεβὴς, έος, ὁ, ἡ, pius, a: ναυνεχὴς, έος, ὁ, ἡ, cordatus: ἐνδεὴς, έος, ὁ, ἡ, indigus, a: ἀδεὴς, metu vacuus, q. d. ἀνευδεοῦς: εὐφυὴς, έος, ὁ, ἡ, bonæ indolis: ἐγκρατὴς, έος, ὁ, ἡ, continens: συγγενὴς, έος, ὁ, ἡ, cognatus, a: εὐγενὴς, έος, ὁ, ἡ, nobilis, generosus.

67. *Excipe composita cum* ἦθος, εος, τὸ, mos: ut ἀήθης, εος, ὁ, ἡ, insuetus, a: κακοήθης, εος, τὸ, pravis moribus imbutus: hinc n. g. κακόηθες, εος, τὸ, prava et inveterata consuetudo. *Item cum* ἀρκέω: ut αὐτάρκης, εος, ὁ, ἡ, sufficiens: ποδάρκης, εος, ὁ, ἡ, pedibus præstans. *Sic* φιλαλήθης, εος, ὁ, ἡ, amans veritatis etc.

68. *Composita cum nomine* ἔτος, εος, τὸ, annus, *acuunt ultimam: Attice vero accentus retrahitur in penultimam,* ut ἐννεαέτης, έος, ὁ, ἡ, novennis, qui vel quæ est novem annorum. Attice ἐννεαέτης, ου,

ὁ, feminínum, ἐνναέτις, ιδος, ἡ, quæ est novem annorum. Sic διετὴς, έος, ὁ, ἡ, biennis, bimulus, a. Matth. ii. 16. ἀπὸ διετοῦς, a bimulo : τριετὴς, triennis : ἑπταετὴς, septennis etc.

69. *Adjectiva in ὺς sunt ὀξύτονα, quorum femininum desinit in εῖα, neutrum in ύ* : ut ἡδὺς, εῖα, ὺ, suavis ; in Genit. ἡδέος, ἡδείας, ἡδέος, etc. *Eundem sortiuntur accentum* βαθὺς, profundus ; βραδὺς, tardus, bardus : βαρὺς, gravis : γλυκὺς, dulcis : εὐθὺς, rectus : παχὺς, crassus : ταχὺς, celer : ὠκὺς, velox. *Sed ab hisce degenerat* ἧμισυς, dimidius, in g. f. ἡμίσεια, in n. g. ἥμισυ : λιγὺς, canorus, λίγεια.

70. *Nullus comparativus et superlativus est* ὀξύτονος : ut βελτίων, melior, κράτιστος, præstantissimus, ὕψιστος, altissimus.

71. *Adjectiva in ος orta a substantivis, non sunt* ὀξύτονα : ut σωτήριος, ου, ὁ, salutaris. Tit. i. 11 : a σωτὴρ, salvator : αἰώνιος, ου, ὁ, ἡ, æternus, a ; ab αἰὼν, ῶνος, ὁ, ævum : χρήσιμος, ου, ὁ, ἡ, utilis, a χρῆσις, εως, ἡ, usus. *Sic habent se quoque adjectiva pleraque in ος composita :* ut θεόπνευστος 2 Tim. iii. 16. *Pleraque dico, quia legimus* ἀγακλυτὸς, Il. ζ. 436. Od. γ, 388.

72. *Substantiva in ία, ab adjectivis in ος, habent α longum, et proinde sunt penacuta :* ut φιλία, ας, ἡ, amicitia, a φίλος, amicus : σοφία, ας, ἡ, sapientia, a σοφὸς, sapiens : κακία, ας, ἡ, malitia, a κακὸς, malus. *In plur. num. etiam manent penacuta :* ut θυσία, ας, ἡ, θυσίαι, ῶν, αἱ, non θύσιαι : ἐπαγγελία, ας, ἡ, ἐπαγγελίαι, ῶν, αἱ, promissiones.

73. *At quæ a substantivis oriuntur, non sunt penacuta,* ut στρατιὰ, ας, ἡ, militia, a στρατὸς, οῦ, ὁ, exercitus : τρυμαλιὰ, ᾶς, ἡ, foramen, a τρύμα, ατος, τό. Luc. xviii. 25. ἀνθρακιὰ, ᾶς, ἡ, prunarum congeries, a nomine subst. ἄνθραξ, ακος, ὁ, carbo : λαλιὰ, ᾶς, ἡ, loquela, a λάλος, loquaculus : καλιὰ, ᾶς, ἡ, nidus, a καλὸν, ου, τὸ, lignum : πατριὰ, ᾶς, ἡ, familia, a πατὴρ, pater : τροχιὰ, ᾶς, ἡ, rotæ vestigium, a τροχὸς, οῦ, ὁ, rota : παιδιὰ, ᾶς, ἡ, ludus puerorum, a παῖς, puer. *Multa tamen sunt ἀνάλογα, euphonia id requirente :* ut διδασκαλία, doctrina, a διδάσκαλος, ὁ, magister, doctor : κοπρία, ας, ἡ, sordes, a κόπρος, ου, ἡ, stercus : ἀγγελία, ας, ἡ, res, quæ nuntiatur, ab ἄγγελος, ου, ὁ, nuntius : λειτουργία, ας, ἡ, ministerium publicum, a λειτουργὸς, οῦ, ὁ, publicus minister.

74. *Eodem modo se habent substantiva in ότης, orta ab adjectivis in ος* : ut αἰσχρότης, ητος, ἡ, turpitudo, ab αἰσχρὸς, ὰ, ὸν, turpis : ἀδροτὴς, ῆτος, ἡ, plenitudo, ab ἁδρὸς, ὰ, ὸν, plenus : ὀχθιστὴς, ῆτος, ἡ, pugna, a δῄος, hostilis, quod est a δαΐω, uro.

Item desinentia in ύτης ; ut πραΰτης, ητος, ἡ, mansuetudo. 1 Pet. iii. 15 : ὀξύτης, ητος, ἡ, acumen. At βραδυτὴς, ῆτος, ἡ, tarditas, a βραδὺς, tardus. 2 Pet. ii. 9 : ταχυτὴς, ῆτος, ἡ, celeritas, a ταχὺς, celer.

75. *Substantiva feminina masculinorum suorum accentum imitantur : cæteris tamen paribus.* Vt λέων, leo, λέαινα : hic manet

accentus in ἐψιλῶ. Sic δώτωρ, dator, δώτειρα: τέκτων, faber, τέκταινα: γείτων, vicinus, γείταινα. Sic πολίτης, ου, ὁ, civis mas, πολῖτις, ιδος, ἡ, civis femina: οἰκέτης, ου, ὁ, famulus, domesticus, οἰκέτις, ιδος, ἡ, famula: δοῦλος, ου, ὁ, servus, δούλη, ης, ἡ, serva: προστάτης, ου, ὁ, patronus, προστάτις, ιδος, ἡ, patrona: ἑταῖρος, ου, ὁ, socius, ἑταίρα, ας ἡ, socia. At Jud. xv. 2. συνέταιρος, ου, ὁ, sodalis, et Jud. xi. 37. συνεταιρὶς, ίδος, ἡ, sodalis, femina.

76. *Ceteris paribus* h. e. *ita tamen, ut ceterarum quoque regularum habeatur ratio.* V. c. δεσπότης, ου, ὁ, herus, δέσποινα, ας, ἡ, hera: ἀρτοπώλης, ου, ὁ, panum venditor, ἀρτόπωλις, εως, ἡ, panum venditrix, non ἀρτοπώλις: παρακοίτης, ου, ὁ, maritus, παράκοιτις, ιδος, ἡ, uxor.

77. *Substantiva in ον tertiæ simplicium non sunt ὀξύτονα*: ut δένδρον, ου, τὸ, arbor: ξύλον, ου, τὸ, lignum: δεῖπνον, ου, τὸ, cœna. Excipe ᾠόν, οῦ, τὸ, *ovum*, ut distinguatur ab ᾤων, ου, τὸ, superior pars domus.

78. *Substantiva in εία ab adjectivis in ης habent α breve, et proinde sunt προπαροξύτονα*: ut ἀλήθεια, είας, ἡ, veritas, ab ἀληθὴς, έος, ὁ, ἡ, verus. *Nomina urbium in εια eandem imitantur flexionem et accentum*: ut Καισάρεια, είας, ἡ, Cæsarea: Ἀντιόχεια, είας, ἡ, Antiochia: Φιλαδέλφεια, ας, ἡ, Philadelphia: Σαμάρεια, είας, ἡ, Samaria. Sic βασίλεια, ας, ἡ, regina, a βασιλεύς.

79. *Substantiva in εια, orta a verbis in εύω, habent α longum ideoque sunt παροξύτονα*: ut βασιλεία, ας, ἡ, regnum, a βασιλεύω, regno, vel sum rex: in pl. num. βασιλεῖαι, ῶν, αἱ, regna: δουλεία, ας, ἡ, servitus, a δουλεύω, servio: προφητεία, ας, ἡ, prophetia, a προφητεύω, propheto: in pl. num. προφητεῖαι, αἱ, prophetiæ.

80. *Substantiva in οια, orta ab adjectivis in ος, habent α breve*: ut ab εὔνοος, benevolus, est εὔνοια, ας, ἡ, benevolentia.

81. *Substantiva in ύνη sunt penacuta*: ut δικαιοσύνη, ης, ἡ, justitia: σωφροσύνη, temperantia: ἀσχημοσύνη, ης, ἡ, gestuum turpitudo, a σχῆμα, τος, τό. Rom. i. 27.

82. *Diphthongi ευ et ου finales in nominibus et adverbiis circumflectuntur*: ut ὦ βασιλεῦ, o rex: πανταχοῦ, ubique. At ἰδοὺ, *ecce*, ad differentiam a. 1 med. imper. ἰδοῦ.

83. *Substantiva in μα et μων, orta a prima persona præteriti passivi, nunquam sunt ὀξύτονα*: ut κρίμα, τος, res indicata, a κέκριμαι; ῥῆμα, τος, τὸ, verbum, ab ἔῤῥημαι. Attice εἴρημαι, abjecto augmento et mutato αι in α: λεῖμμα, τος, τὸ, reliquiæ Rom. xi. 5.; a. 1 præt. pass. λέλειμμαι, relictus fui, verbi λείπω, linquo, abjecto λε et mutato αι in α: γνώμων, ονος, ὁ, gnomon, stilus horas indicans, ab ἔγνωσμαι, ubi σίγμα abjicitur εὐφωνίας ἕνεκα.

84. *At verbalia in μος a prima persona præt. pass. sunt omnia ὀξύτονα*: ut ψαλμὸς, οῦ, ὁ, psalmus ab ἔψαλμαι, verbi ψάλλω: ἐπισιτισμὸς, οῦ, ὁ, cibaria. Luc. ix. 12: ὑπογραμμὸς, οῦ, ὁ, exemplum. *Quædam εὐφωνίας ἕνεκα θ interponunt*: ut κλαυθμὸς, οῦ, ὁ, fletus,

pro κλαυμὸς, a κλαίω, in fut. κλαύσω: sic βαθμὸς, οῦ, ὁ, gradus: κινηθμὸς, οῦ, ὁ, motus.

85. *Sic quoque nomina verbalia in* μη *se habent*: ut γραμμὴ, ῆς, ἡ, linea: στιγμὴ, ῆς, ἡ, punctum. At γνώμη, ης, ἡ, sententia, decretum.

86. *Substantiva in* ις *et* ια, *orta a secunda persona præt. passivi, nunquam sunt* ὀξύτονα: ut κρίσις, εως, ἡ, actus judicandi: κλισία, ας, ἡ, discubitus. Luc. ix. 14: θυσία, ας, ἡ, sacrificium: γνῶσις, εως, ἡ, notitia: ἀγνωσία, ας, ἡ, ignorantia: δοκιμασία, ας, ἡ, probatio.

87. *Nomina verbalia in* τος, *orta a tertia sing. præt. passivi, passive capiuntur, et semper sunt* ὀξύτονα: ut ὁρατὸς, visibilis, ab ἑώραται: ποιητὸς, factus, a πεποίηται: διδακτὸς, doctus. Joh. vi. 45; a δεδίδακται; εὐλογητὸς, benedictus, ab εὐλόγηται, vel Attice ηὐλόγηται. *Excipe* 1. *composita pleraque*; ut ἀπόβλητος, rejectaneus, 1 Tim. iv. 4: ἀπόδεκτος, acceptus, 1 Tim. ii. 3: εὐπρόσδεκτος, idem, Rom. xv. 31: παράκλητος, ου, ὁ, advocatus: 2. *nomina propria virorum, idque differentiæ causa*: v. g. τιτὸς, *honoratus*; at quum tribuitur viro, scribitur *Τίτος* Galat. ii. 3. Sic ἐραστὸς, *dilectus*, at quum viro tribuitur, accentus retrahitur, *Ἔραστος* Rom. xvi. 23.

88. *Item omnia adjectiva in* ικος, *hinc orta, active capiuntur, et sunt* ὀξύτονα: ut ποιητικὸς, factivus, a ποιητὸς: διδακτικὸς, aptus ad docendum, a διδακτός. *Hunc accentum imitantur etiam alia in* ικος: ut μουσικὸς, canendi peritus: γραμματικὸς, scribendi gnarus: μνημονικὸς, memor: λειτουργικὸς, ministratorius. Hebr. i. 14.

89. *Verbalia in* της *sunt* ὀξύτονα: ut αὐλητὴς, οῦ, ὁ, tibicen: κριτὴς, οῦ, ὁ, judex: μαθητὴς, οῦ, ὁ, discipulus: μιμητὴς, οῦ, ὁ, imitator.

Verbalia in της, *a verbis in* μι *sunt penacuta*; ut θέτης, ου, ὁ, positor: νομοθέτης, ου, ὁ, legislator: προφήτης, ου, ὁ, propheta: γνώστης, ου, ὁ, cognitor: ἀναγνώστης, ου, ὁ, lector: καρδιογνώστης, ου, ὁ, cordium scrutator.

Diphthongus in ψεύστης retinet accentum in penultima.

90. *Verbalia in* τηρ, *ad unum* h. e. *nullo excepto, sunt* ὀξύτονα: at χαρακτὴρ, ῆρος, ὁ, character. Hebr. i. 3: στατὴρ, ῆρος, ὁ, stater, genus numismatis. Matth. xviii. 27.

91. *Verbalia in* τωρ *sunt penacuta*; ut κτήτωρ, ορος, ὁ, possessor: ῥήτωρ, ορος, ὁ, rhetor.

92. *Verbalia in* τήριον *et* τρον *nunquam habent accentum in ultima*: ut θυσιαστήριον, ου, τὸ, altare: μυστήριον, ου, τὸ, mysterium: οἰκητήριον, ου, τὸ, habitaculum. 2 Cor. ii. 5: ἀκροατήριον, ου, τὸ, auditorium: ποτήριον, ου, τὸ, poculum. 1 Cor. x. 16: κάτοπτρον, ου, τὸ, speculum; κρητήριον, ου, τὸ, tribunal: διδάκτρον, ου, τὸ, merces, quæ datur docenti: λύτρον, ου, τὸ, pecunia, quam damus pro redimendo captivo. Sic ἀντίλυτρον, ου, τὸ, idem: σῶστρον, ου, τὸ,

quod damus ei, qui nos servavit: κόμιστρον, ου, τὸ, quod damus ei, qui nostra bajulavit: ἀμφίβληστρον, ου, τὸ, verriculum, rete, quod utrimque jacitur. At λουτρὸν, οῦ, τὸ, *lavacrum*, differentiæ causa: λοῦτρον, ου, τὸ enim significat *aquam sordidam, qua quis se lavit.* Aliquando σῖγμα additur: ut in ἀμφίβληστρον: aliquando tollitur: ut in verbali γνώμη ab ἔγνωσμαι, de quo supra num. 83. quarum subtilitatum Grammaticarum optimus magister est usus, prout Poeta scripsit:

Solus et artifices qui facit, usus erit.

93. *Substantiva verbalia in* ος, *a præterito medio orta, accentum non habent in fine:* ut λόγος, ου, ὁ, sermo, a λέλογα: δόμος, ου, ὁ, domus, g. f. a δέδομα: τόμος, ου, ὁ, sectio, a τέτομα, secui, verbi τέμνω, seco: ἄγγελος, ου, ὁ, angelus, a præt. med. ἤγγελα. At σκοπὸς, οῦ, ὁ, meta, ad quam collimamus, ab ἔσκοπα, verbi σκέπτομαι, dispicio. *Raro sunt declin.* 2 *contractorum;* a ψύχος, εος, τὸ, frigus, ab ἔψυχα, verbi ψύχω, refrigero.

94. *Excipiuntur, quæ differunt:* ut τρόχος, ου, ὁ, cursus. Joh. iii. 6: τροχὸς, οῦ, ὁ, rota, a τέτροχα, pro quo usitatum est δέδρομα; unde etiam δρόμος, ου, ὁ, cursus: πρόδρομος, ου, ὁ, anteambulo, præcursor: τρόφος, ου, ὁ, qui alitur, τροφὸς, οῦ, ὁ, ἡ, altor, nutrix: τόμος, ου, ὁ, sectio, pars, at τομὸς, ἡ, ὸν, penetrans. Hebr. iv. 12. Nota: *accentus est in fine eorum verbalium, quæ active capiuntur.*

95. *Adjectiva contra sunt* ὀξύτονα: ut λοιπὸς, ἡ, ὸν, reliquus, a præt. med. λέλοιπα.

96. *Verbalia in* η *et* α, *a præterito medio orta, sunt* ὀξύτονα: ut τομὴ, ῆς, ἡ, sectio: στολὴ, ῆς, ἡ, vestis: ῥιπὴ, ῆς, ἡ, jactus, a ῥίπτω, præt. med. ἔῤῥιπα: τρυφὴ, ῆς, ἡ, deliciæ, a præt. med. τέτρυφα, verbi θρύπτω, frango: ᾠδὴ, pro ἀοιδὴ, ῆς, ἡ, cantus, a præt. med. ᾄοιδα, quod est ab ἀείδω; σπονδὴ, ῆς, ἡ, fœdus, ab ἔσπονδα, verbi σπένδω, libo: σπορὰ, ᾶς, ἡ, satio, a præt. med. ἔσπορα, sevi: διαφορὰ, ᾶς, ἡ, differentia, a διαφέρω, tanquam a præt. med. διαπέφορα, quod non est usitatum: φθορὰ, ᾶς, ἡ, corruptio. 1 Cor. xv. 42; a præt. med. ἔφθορα, verbi φθείρω. At βλάβη, ης, ἡ, damnum, a βλάπτω: κάπη, ης, ἡ, præsepe, a κάπτω, edo.

97. *Idem sæpe observatur in verbalibus ortis ab aliis temporibus, ut a præterito activo etc.* ut διδαχὴ, ῆς, ἡ, doctrina, a δεδίδαχα, docui, verbi διδάσκω: ταραχὴ, ῆς, ἡ, perturbatio, a ταράσσω: ἁφὴ, ῆς, ἡ, nexus, ab ἧφα, verbi ἅπτω, apto, necto. At σκάφη, ης, ἡ, scapha, differentiæ caussa: nam σκαφὴ, ῆς, ἡ, est effossio. Sic δόξα, ης, ἡ, opinio, gloria, ab a. 1 ἔδοξα, putavi, verbi δοκέω, ῶ: θήκη, ης, ἡ, ab a. 1 ἔθηκα: γένος, a γένω, pro quo usitatum γίνομαι, vel γίγνομαι, poetice γείνομαι: νέμος, εος, τὸ, nemus, a νέμω.

98. *Præterita et aorista tempora dissyllaba priori longa servant accentum eundem in compositis:* ut εἶπον, dixi, προεῖπον, prædixi: ἧκα, misi, συνῆκα, intellexi: ἧφα, nexui, καθῆχα, attigi: ἵγμαι, ab ἱκνοῦμαι, pervenio, ἐφῖγμαι. Sic in præs. infinit. κεῖσθαι,

jacere, ἐπικεῖσθαι, incumbere : θεῖναι, ponere, προσθεῖναι, apponere : περιέχω, comprehendo, a. 2 περιέσχον : ἐπάγω, a. 1 ἐπῆξα ; etiam discriminis caussa, ne confundatur cum ἔπηξα, a verbo πήγνυμι. At οἶδα, novi, συνοῖδα, conscius sum.

99. *Neutra participia sedem retinent accentus masculini :* ut ἀγιάζον, non ἁγίαζον, ab ἁγιάζων : πῦρ καταναλίσκον ignis consumens. Hebr. xii. 29. κύμβαλον ἀλαλάζον, cymbalum tinniens. 1 Cor. xiii. 1 : τὸ ἐπιβάλλον μέρος, partem mihi competentem. Luc. xv. 12 : λατρεῦον, a masculino λατρεύων. Act. xxvi. 7 : φῶς περιλάμψον. ibid. v. 13 : ἀναβαῖνον. Apoc. xi. 7 : τὸ εὑρίσκον. Luc. xi. 24. Sic τὸ γηράσκον, senescens. Hebr. viii. 13 : καθῆκον, quod convenit. Act. xxii. 22 : ἄρσεν διανοῖγον μήτραν, mas aperiens matricem. Luc. ii. 23.

100. *Omnis imperativus accentum habet in antepenultima, si eam habeat : secus in penultima :* ut 1 Tim. vi. 11. φεῦγε, fuge. 1 Tim. iv. 16. ἔπεχε σεαυτῷ, intentus esto tibi : ἐπίμενε αὐτοῖς, permane in iis. Joh. viii. 11. μηκέτι ἁμάρτανε, ne pecca amplius. Luc. vi. 30. μὴ ἀπαίτει, pro ἀπαίτει, ne repetito. *Excipiuntur quinque activa :* εἰπὲ, dic, ad differentiam εἶπε, dixit : λαβὲ, cape, ne videatur λάβε, pro ἔλαβε : εὑρὲ, inveni, ne accipiatur pro εὗρε, invenit ; ἰδὲ, vide, ad differentiam ἴδε, vidit, pro εἶδε, quamvis in N. T. semper legamus ἴδε, ecce, Rom. ii. 17. etc. tanquam adverbium : ἐλθὲ, veni : item *omnia aorista* 2 *med. imperativi :* ut γενοῦ, ἔσθω, sis, esto.

101. *Participia præt. act. sunt ὀξύτονα :* ut ἡμαρτηκὼς, ότος, ὁ, qui peccavit. Gen. xliv. 22 : in f. g. ἡμαρτηκυῖα, υίας, in n. g. ἡμαρτηκὸς, ότος.

102. *Participia præteriti passivi sunt penacuta :* ut κεκορεσμένος, saturatus ; βεβλημένος, projectus.

103. *Item verbalia desinentia in* έος : ut βλητέος, conjiciendus. Marc. ii. 22 : φευκτέον, fugiendum. Vide supra num. 23.

104. *Sed ut multa paucis complectar, quisquis cupit in accentuum doctrina expeditus esse et certus, declinationes et conjugationes exacte discat. Est enim perpetua et constans singularum vocum ἀναλογία.*

105. *Adverbia accentum primitivorum sequuntur :* ut θεόθεν, divinitus, a θεός : οὐρανόθεν, cœlitus, ab οὐρανός : ἀγρόθεν, rure, ab ἀγρός : ἐγγύθεν, cominus, ab ἐγγύς : οἴκοθεν, domo, non οἰκόθεν, ab οἶκος : ἄλλοθεν, aliunde, ab ἄλλος : παιδιόθεν, a pueritia, a παιδίον, puerulus. Marc. ix. 21 : θύραζε, foras, a θύρα, ας, ἡ, janua. Sic Ἀθῆναι, ῶν, αἱ, Athenæ : unde est Ἀθήνηθε, Athenis : Ἀθήνησι, Athenis : Ἀθήναζε, Athenas.

106. *Legimus tamen* ποντόθεν, e mari, a πόντος, ου, ὁ, mare : πεδόθεν, e terra, a πέδον, ου, τὸ, solum, terra : κυκλόθεν, undique. Apoc. iv. 3. Sed Budæus legit κύκλοθεν. Et veri sit simile, culpa eorum, qui a manu fuerunt, menda ejusmodi irrepsisse, ut jam pu-

temus legendum, πάντοθεν, pro παντόθεν, et κύκλοθεν pro κυκλόθεν: πάντοθεν, undique, tanquam a genit. plur. πάντων.

107. *Adverbia in ως formantur a Genitivo plurali, mutato ν in σῖγμα*: ut σοφῶς, sapienter, a σοφὸς, in Genit. plur. σοφῶν: ῥητῶς, diserte, a ῥητῶν: ἐπισταμένως, perite, ab ἐπισταμένων: φειδομένως, parce, a φειδομένων, verbi φείδομαι, parco. Sic οὐσιώδης, εος, ὁ, ἡ, in genit. pl. οὐσιωδέων, ῶν: unde est οὐσιωδῶς, essentialiter: κεφαλαιώδης, εος, ὁ, ἡ, summarius, Genit. plur. κεφαλαιωδέων, ῶν: unde est κεφαλαιωδῶς, summatim. Ab hac itaque regula deflectunt, qui scribunt αὐτάρκως, pro αὐταρκῶς: φιλαλήθως, pro φιλαληθῶς.

108. *Adverbia in ὶωτα desinentia sunt ὀξύτονα*: ut πανστρατὶ, cum toto exercitu: πανοικὶ, cum tota domo: ἀθεὶ, sine deo: αὐτολεξεὶ, iisdem verbis: αὐθωρεὶ, eadem hora: παμπληθεὶ, universa turba. Luc. xxiii. 18. Sic Ἑβραϊστὶ, Hebraice: Ἑλληνιστὶ, Græce: Ῥωμαϊστὶ, Latine. Joh. xvii. 20. At ab ἀντὶ est ἔναντι, coram. Luc. i. 8: et ἀπέναντι Act. iii. 16. Nomen tamen hinc ortum ἐναντίος, *contrarius*, retinet accentum sui Thematis.

109. *Adverbia quantitatis in άκι sunt penacuta*, ut δισσάκις, bis: τρισσάκις, ter: τετράκις, quater: πεντάκις, quinquies: ἑξάκις, sexies: ἑπτάκις, septies: ὀλιγάκις, raro: πολλάκις, etiam post Æoliam apocopen τοῦ σ πολλάκι, sæpe; ὁσάκις, quoties, ἀόριστον: ποσάκις, quoties? ἐρωτιματικόν.

110. *Adverbia in δὸν sunt ὀξύτονα*; ut ὁμοθυμαδὸν, unanimiter: ῥοιζηδὸν, cum stridore: ἀγεληδὸν, gregatim: κυνδὸν, more canino.

111. *Adverbia in δην desinentia sunt παροξύτονα*: ut διαῤῥήδην, diserte: συλλήβδην, summatim: ἄρδην, penitus, ab αἴρω, tollo.

112. *Præpositiones dissyllabæ accentum in fine habent*: ut ἀπὸ, a, ab: παρὰ, apud, præter: ἐνὶ, poetice pro ἐν: ἔνι vero pro ἔνεστι, inest; ut μέτα, pro μέτεστι, competit; πάρα, pro πάρεστι, adest.

113. *Præpositiones immediate postpositæ casui, quem regunt, accentum retrahunt in primam*; ut εἰρήνης πέρι, de pace, pro περὶ εἰρήνης: ἀνὰ tamen et διὰ differentiæ causa retinent, ne διὰ videri possit esse accusativus a ζεὺς, Jupiter et ἄνα, vocativus ab ἄναξ, rex. Dico *immediate*; v. g. Act. xiii. 23. τούτου ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος, *ex hujus semine Deus*: ubi ἀπὸ accentum retinet in fine, quia casus genitivus non præcedit immediate.

114. Ὑφὲν, *instar makkaph Hebraici, præcedentem dictionem natura ἔντονον, accentu destituit*; ut ἀειπαρθένος, *semper virgo*; epitheton beatæ virginis Mariæ. Scilicet per ὑφὲν, q. d. ὑφ' ἓν, *sub unum*, duæ voces coalescunt in unam et proinde quoque tanquam una vox uno duntaxat accentu proferuntur.

115. *Syntaxi s. compositione quandoque fit, ut plures dictiones coalescant, veluti in unam, unde quarundam nativo objecto accentu, unus tantum manet in præcipua dictione*; ut τουτέστι, hoc

est : τοκαταρχὰς, in principio : τοτελευταῖον, postremo : τοκαθημέραν, quotidie : τοπρωΐ, mane. Quamvis etiam scribatur τὸ πρωΐ, τὸ καθημέραν, et pro καθημέραν, καθ' ἡμέραν etc. Sic pro τοΐσδε scribitur τοισόδε, abjecto circumflexu, pro τοίασδε, τοιᾶσθε. 2 Pet. i. 17. διὸ, pro δι' ὃ, quapropter. Idque fit τῆς ταχυγραφίας ἕνεκα.

116. *Ad extremum, quum dictiones encliticæ, ut vocant, negotium facessant tironibus; istæ quoque enodandæ sunt tricæ, ut prima fronte tam de vera accentuum sede, quam de mendosis accentibus ferre possimus judicium.*

117. *Dictiones vero encliticæ sunt sequentes. Ex articulo* τοῦ, poëtice τεῦ, pro indefinito τινὸς, alicujus, τῷ, pro τινὶ, alicui.

Ex nomine τὶς, τὶ, aliquis, per omnes casus. Vide supra num. 47.

Ex pronomine μοῦ, μεῦ, mei, μοὶ, mihi, μὲ, me. At ἐγὼ, ἐμοῦ, ἐμὲ, encliticis non sunt accensenda. Sic σοῦ, (τεῦ, σεῦ) sui, σοὶ, tibi, Dorice τοὶ, σὲ, te, Dorice τέ. At σὺ, τὺ, sicut et τέο, non patiuntur ἔγκλισιν. Sic οὗ (εὗ, ἕο) sui, οἱ, sibi, ἑ, se, σφὲ, σφωὲ, σφῶ, 3 pers. nam σφῶ, 2 personæ non est enclitica : in plur. num. σφίσι et σφὶν, seu σφὶ, pro σφίσι, ut et σφᾶς, pro σφέας, et ψὲ, pro σφέ. His adde poëtica pronomina μὶν, et νὶν, pro ἓ vel αὐτόν.

118. *Ex verbis sunt enclitica* εἰμὶ, sum, εἶς, es, ἐστὶ, est, ἐσμὲν, sumus, ἐστὲ, estis, εἰσὶ, sunt. Sic φημὶ, inquam, φησὶ, ait, φαμὲν, dicimus, φατὲ, dicitis, φασὶ, Dorice φαντὶ, aiunt, inquiunt : ubi secundæ singulares εἶς, vel ε�establishes, es, et φὴς, ais, per ης acutum (ut differat a 2 sing. a. 2 act. φῆς, pro ἔφης, dixisti) non patiuntur ἔγκλισιν.

119. *Ex adverbio* πῶς, quodammodo, πῶ, adhuc, dum, πῆ, alicubi, ποῦ, uspiam, circiter, et alia id genus : quando non sunt interrogativa, sed indefinita : item πόθεν, alicunde, ποθὲ, alicubi : ποτὲ, aliquando.

120. *Ex conjunctionibus multæ sunt encliticæ et quandoque μόρια συμπληρωματικὰ, h. e.* particulæ expletivæ ; ut τὲ, et γὲ, quidem, πὲρ, quamvis, postpositum participio : κὲ, κὲν, dictiunculæ potentiales : in prosa respondent τῷ ἄν : ῥὰ facile, νὺ, nunc, θὴν, quidem, sunt sæpe expletivæ particulæ. Huc pertinet ἓς, Accusativo postpositum, ubi valet *ad*, quod et ipsum est dictio enclitica.

REGULÆ.

121. 1) *Dictio enclitica rejicit accentum in ultimam præcedentis vocabuli proparoxytoni, quem tamen adventitium accentum molliuscule esse enuntiandum, εὐφωνία suadet.* Marc. i. 30. ἀποκρίθητέ μοι, respondete mihi. Rom. ii. 19. πέποιθάς τε, fidisque. Rom. iii. 3. ἠπίστησάν τινες, increduli fuerunt quidem : σοῦ, tui,

non reponit proprium seu nativum accentum (vide supra num. 17), seu acutum: idem fit in μοῦ, mei, οῦ, sui. Caussa est ἡ εὐφωνία, ultima enim syllaba, in quam hæc dictio enclitica rejicit talem accentum, prorsus aversatur circumflexum. Ubicunque enim circumflexus est, κρᾶσιν notare solet, aut saltem quantitatem longam, quorum neutrum hic locum habet, et præterea moram requirit. Joh. xvii. 11. ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου, nomine tuo. Col. iv. 18. μνημονεύετέ μου τῶν δεσμῶν, memores estote vinculorum meorum. Luc. iv. 7. ἐνώπιόν μου, coram me.

122. 2) *Dictio enclitica monosyllaba amittit accentum præcedente vocabulo paroxytono, dissyllaba contra retinet;* ut Joh. iv. 16. φώνησον τὸν ἄνδρα σου, voca maritum tuum. Joh. vii. 27. πόθεν ἐστὶν, unde sit. Joh. xv. 14. φίλοι μου ἐστὲ, amici mei estis: hic μου amittit accentum; ἐστὲ vero retinet in fine. Joh. xiv. 19. ὁ κόσμος με οὐκ ἔτι θεωρεῖ, mundus me non amplius conspiciet. Joh. xxi. 18. ἄλλος ζώσει σε, alius cinget te. Joh. xxi. 22. σὺ ἀκολούθει μοι, tu sequere me. Luc. xxi. 35. ὄντος μου μεθ' ὑμῶν, quum essem vobiscum. Act. ii. 5. μέρος τι, partem quandam. Act. xvi. 16. παιδίσκην τινὰ, puellam quandam. Rom. vii. 9. ἐγὼ ἔζων χωρὶς νόμου ποτὲ, ego vivebam sine lege quondam. Rom. viii. 16. ὅτι ἐσμὲν τέκνα, quod simus filii. Rom. xiv. 8. τοῦ Κυρίου ἐσμὲν, Jovæ sumus. Hebr. xii. 8. ἄρα νόθοι ἐστὲ, nempe spurii estis. Jac. iii. 5. ἡ γλῶσσα μικρὸν μέλος ἐστὲ, lingua parvum membrum est. 2 Pet. i. 13. ἐφ' ὅσον εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι, quamdiu sum in hoc tabernaculo. 1 Cor. iii. 20. ὅτι εἰσὶ μάταιοι, quod vani sint. *Quidam hic* τὶς, τὶ, *excipiunt;* ut Joh. ii. 24. ἵνα τὶς μαρτυρήσῃ, ut aliquis testaretur. Conf. Græcos interpretes V. T. Ex. xxii. 5. 16. Deut. xxii. 13. 2 Sam. x. 12. Prov. vi. 27. etc.

123. 3) *Præcedente vocabulo oxytono dictio enclitica quæcunque accentum prorsus amittit;* ut Luc. v. 21. τίς ἐστιν οὗτος; quis est iste? Luc. x. 13. οὐαί σοι, væ tibi! Joh. xix. 21. βασιλεύς εἰμι, rex sum. Joh. xx. 23. ἄν τινων ἀφῆτε, si quorum remiseritis. Act. x. 4. τί ἐστι, κύριε; quid est, domine? Act. xxv. 19. ζητήματα δέ τινα, quæstiones vero quasdam. 1 Cor. iii. 9. Θεοῦ γάρ ἐσμεν συνεργοὶ, Dei enim sumus administri. Rom. i. 13. ἵνα καρπόν τινα σχῶ, ut fructum aliquem consequar. Rom. iv. 16 ὅς ἐστι πατὴρ πάντων, qui est pater omnium. Luc. xiii. 10. καί εἰσι, et sunt; ἐστὶ quidem post καὶ (vide infra) habet accentum in prima, sed τοῦ εἰσὶ etc. alia est ratio.

124. *Præcedente dictione ἀτόνῳ* (supra num. 16.) *dictio enclitica in eam accentum suum reponit;* ut Jac. i. 26. εἴ τις δοκεῖ, si quis videtur. *Alia tamen est ratio adverbii negativi* οὐ, οὐκ, *post quod* εἰμὶ, ἐσμὲν, ἐστὲ, εἰσὶ, *accentum retinent;* ut Luc. xviii. 11. οὐκ εἰμὶ, non sum. Rom. vi. 15. οὐκ ἐσμέν. Joh. xv. 19. οὐκ ἐστέ: scribitur etiam τουτέστι, tanquam vox unica. Sic post εἰ. 2 Cor. xiii. 5. εἰ ἐστὲ, si estis.

125. 4) *Præcedente vocabulo properispomeno, dictio enclitica accentum suum reponit in ejus ultimam.* Matth. xxvii. 24. ἀθῷός εἰμι, innocens sum. Rom. viii. 14. οὗτοί εἰσιν υἱοὶ Θεοῦ, hi sunt filii Dei. 1 Cor. xii. 5. ἓν σῶμά ἐσμεν, unum corpus sumus. Luc. i. 47. τῷ Θεῷ τῷ σωτῆρί μου, deo servatori meo. Luc. i. 38. κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου, secundum verbum tuum. Luc. v. 24. πορεύου εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου, abi domum tuam. 1 Cor. xii. 22. ἀναγκαῖά εἰσι, necessaria sunt.

126. 5) *Præcedente vero vocabulo perispomeno, dictio enclitica quæcunque penitus suum amittit accentum:* ut Joh. xix. 11. εἰ μὴ ἦν σοι δεδομένον, nisi tibi datum esset. Joh. xxi. 14. ἀγαπᾷς με; diligis me? Act. xiv. 15. ὁμοιοπαθεῖς ἐσμεν. Act. xxii. 3. ὑμεῖς ἐστε, vos estis. Rom. xi. 8. εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ μου, gratias ago Deo meo.

De Syncliticis.

127. 6) *Quum complures dictiones encliticæ concurrunt, ex sequente in præcedentem transfertur accentus, ultima manente nuda seu sine accentu;* ut Luc. ix. 38. ὅτι μονογενής ἐστί μοι. Luc. x. 29. τίς ἐστί μου πλησίον; Quis est meus proximus? Luc. xix. 9. εἴ τινός τι ἐσυκοφάντησα, si quid cuipiam per calumniam eripui. Rom. iii. 7. καθώς φασί τινες, prout quidam aiunt. Rom. xiii. 4. Θεοῦ διάκονός ἐστί σοι εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν. Gal. i. 7. εἰ μή τινές εἰσιν. Act. xviii. 10. διότι λαός ἐστί μοι πολύς. At Tit. i. 6. εἴτις ἐστί: quasi εἴτις sit vox composita, et contra οὔ τινος, quasi non sit vox composita.

128. *Excipe* μοῦ, σοῦ, οὗ, μοὶ etc. Joh. viii. 3: μαθηταί μου ἐστέ. Rom. i. 9. μάρτυς γάρ μοί ἐστὶν ὁ Θεός. Matth. iii. 11. ἰσχυρότερός μου ἐστὶν, fortior me est. Phil. i. 8. μάρτυς γάρ μου ἐστί. Joh. xv. 4. ὑμεῖς φίλοι μου ἐστὲ, vos amici mei estis. Act. ix. 15. σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς μοί ἐστὶν οὗτος. Matth. xviii. 8. καλόν σοί ἐστίν. Joh. xix. 11. διὰ τοῦτο ὁ παραδιδούς με σοί. item *quoties intervenit distinctio quantulacunque, licet non semper sit expressa;* ut Act. ix. 6. λαληθήσεταί σοι τί σε δεῖ ποιεῖν. Hic post σοι est tacita quædam distinctiuncula, ob quam σοι ex regula non habet accentum. Sic Act. x. 6. οὗτος λαλήσει σοι, τί σε δεῖ ποιεῖν.

129. *Dictiones encliticæ in præpositiones præcedentes raro accentum suum rejiciunt, idque propter εὐφωνίαν.* Luc. iv. 10. Act. xxi. 21. περὶ σοῦ, de te. Joh. xvii. 5. παρὰ σοί, apud te. Matth. xviii. 15. εἰς σέ. Joh. xiii. 17. ὑπὲρ σοῦ, pro te. Act. xxviii. 22. παρὰ σοῦ, a te. Luc. xi. 35. et c. xix. 44. Joh. xvii. 21. ἐν σοί, in te. Act. xviii. 10. Joh. iii. 26. μετὰ σοῦ, tecum. Act. xxvi. 3. διὰ σοῦ, per te. Matth. v. 42. ἀπὸ σοῦ, a te. Act. xxiii. 30. ἐπὶ σοῦ, coram te. *Interdum regulam sequuntur.* Joh. xxi. 3.

σύν σοι, tecum. Joh. xvii. 11. Luc. vii. 20. et. c. xviii. 16. πρός σε, ad te. Joh. vi. 65. Act. xxii. 10. πρός με, ad me. Luc. xviii. 9. πρός τινας, ad quosdam. Act. ix. 43. παρά τινι, apud quendam. *Quandoque utroque modo se habent;* ut Act. xiii. 11. et c. xix. 22. ἐπί σε: idque in fine periodi. *At contra* Deut. xxviii. 2. ἐπὶ σὲ, contra te. Sic Joh. xxi. 23. τί πρὸς σέ; Quid tua refert? Alii τί πρός σε;

130. 7) *Dictiones encliticæ retinent accentum suum ob quinque caussas, nempe ob εὐφωνίαν, ἔμφασιν, διαφορὰν, παρένθεσιν,* et *διαστολὴν, h. e. distinctionem.*

Εὐφωνίας ἕνεκα. Act. xxv. 7. οὔτε εἰς Καίσαρα τὶ ἡμαρτὸν, neque in Cæsarem quicquam peccavi. *Hic τὶ retinet accentum, quem si rejiceret ex regula in ultimam præcedentis dictionis, tam κακόφωνον, quam obscurum foret.* Vide editionem N. T. ab Henrico Stephano emendatissime editam a. 1576. Sic ἕνεκα μοῦ dicimus. At Rom. viii. 36. ἕνεκά σου (pro ἕνεκα σοῦ) θανατούμεθα, tua caussa occidimur.

Ἐμφάσεως ἕνεκα. Rom. xi. 18. ἀλλ' ἡ ῥίζα σέ: hic σὲ retinet accentum ob emphasin. 1 Tim. iv. 14. ὃ ἐδόθη σοὶ, quod tibi datum est: hic σοὶ retinet accentum ob ἔμφασιν. 2 Cor. xi. 16. μή τις μὲ δόξῃ ἄφρονα εἶναι, ne quis me putet mente captum: μὲ hic retinet accentum ob ἔμφασιν.

Διαφορᾶς ἕνεκα. Eph. ii. 13. οἱ ποτὲ ὄντες, pro οἵ ποτε ὄντες: discriminis caussa, ne quis putet οἱ esse ex nominativo singulari ὅς, qui. 2 Pet. iii. 9. ὡς τίνες etc., non ὥς τινες, ne videretur ὡς positum pro οὕτως. Sic Luc. xiii. 9. ὁ σὲ, non ὅ σε, ne ὁ videretur articulus postpositivus g. n.

131. *Distinctio* (ἡ διαστολὴ) *facit, ut dictio enclitica suum retineat accentum, idque in principio distinctionis semper, in fine rarissime.* Luc. iv. 6. σοὶ δώσω, tibi dabo: σοὶ hic retinet accentum in principio periodi. Luc. vii. 14. νεανίσκε, σοὶ λέγω, adolescens, tibi dico: hic σοὶ retinet accentum, nam est κόμμα et ob ἔμφασιν. Matth. xvii. 4. σοὶ μίαν. ibid. v. 27. ἀντὶ ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ, pro me et te: σοῦ hic retinet accentum ob finem periodi nec non ἔμφασιν. Phil. i. 15. τινὲς μὲν, τινὲς δὲ, alii quidem, alii vero etc. Hic utrumque τινὲς accentum retinet ob distinctionem: unum enim est in principio periodi, alterum in principio τοῦ κόμματος. Joh. xiii. 3. εἰμὶ γὰρ, sum enim: hic εἰμὶ retinet accentum in principio coli. Luc. x. 22. ἔμπροσθέν σου: hic σου, in fine periodi non retinet accentum, sed rejicit in vocem proxime præcedentem: Sic Joh. xiv. 11. πιστεύετέ μοι, in fine periodi.

132. *Παρενθέσεως ἕνεκα.* Marc. v. 41. τὸ κοράσιον (σοὶ λέγω) ἔγειραι, puella, tibi dico, surge: hic σοὶ retinet accentum ob ἔνδειξιν, et παρένθεσιν, quæ ipsa est distinctionis species. Hebr. viii. 5. ὅρα γὰρ (φησὶ) vide enim, inquit. Alii pro parenthesecos signis hic habent duo κόμματα, sed res eodem redit. Marc. ii. 10.

(λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ) σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειραι, dicit ad paralyticum, tibi dico, surge. Conf. Luc. v. 23. Act. xxvi. 25.

133. *Ἔστι accentum sortitur in prima syllaba: primo in principio sententiæ, sive sit completa, sive non.* Joh. v. 2. ἔστι δὲ, est vero. 1 Cor. xv. 44. ἔστι σῶμα ψυχικὸν καὶ ἔστι σῶμα πνευματικόν. 2 Tim. iv. 11. ἔστι γάρ μοι εὔχρηστος, est enim mihi perutilis. Matth. xiii. 39. ὁ δὲ ἐχθρὸς, ὁ σπείρας αὐτὰ, ἔστιν ὁ διάβολος, hostis, qui sevit illa zizania, est diabolus.

134. *Deinde ἔστι accentum in prima syllaba habet post voculas* οὐκ, ὡς, καὶ, εἰ, ἀλλ', τοῦτ'; ut Matth. x. 24. οὐκ ἔστι μαθητὴς ὑπὲρ τὸν διδάσκαλον, non est discipulus super magistrum. Joh. i. 48. ἐν ᾧ δόλος οὐκ ἔστι, in quo non est dolus. Joh. xx. 30. ἃ οὐκ ἔστι γεγραμμένα, quæ non sunt scripta. Sic ἔνι pro ἔστι. Jac. i. 16. παρ' ᾧ οὐκ ἔνι παραλλαγὴ, apud quem non est mutatio. Col. iii. 6. καὶ ἔστι, et est. Rom. x. 6. τοῦτ' ἔστι, hoc est. 2 Reg. x. 24. ἴδετε εἰ ἔστι μεθ' ὑμῶν (τις) τῶν δούλων Κυρίου, videte, an sit vobiscum aliquis ex servis domini. Joh. vii. 28. ἀλλ' ἔστιν ἀληθινὸς, ὁ πέμψας με, sed verax est, qui misit me.

135. *Accentus quoque multas distinguit voces;* ut Luc. iv. 9. εἰ εἶ, si es. Sic differunt ἡ hæc, ἣ qua, ᾗ, (ab ἦμι, pro φημὶ, per aphæresin), dixit, ᾖ, erat, ἡ, sit, ᾗ, qua: item ᾦ, ὦ: μύριοι, decies mille, μυρίοι, infiniti. Discrimen est inter ᾗ, τε, et hæc, Rom. i. 20: et ᾗτε, quaque: inter μόνη, sola, μονὴ, mansio. Joh. xiv. 17. ὃ ὁ κόσμος οὐ δύναται λαβεῖν: hic differunt ὃ et ὁ. Sic ἀλλὰ, sed et, ἄλλα, alia: ὦμος, ου, ὁ, humerus, et ὠμὸς, crudelis: ἐχθρὰ, inimica, ἔχθρα, inimicitia: εἶσι, vadit, et εἰσὶ, sunt: κρίνω, judico, et κρινῶ, judicabo: στρέβλη, ης, ἡ, tormentum, et στρεβλὴ, ῆς, ἡ, perversa: ζωὸν, vivum, et ζῶον, animal: κῦδος, gloria, et κύδος, probrum: ἐραστὸς, amatus, at Ἔραστος, nomen viri. Act. xix. 22.

136. *Græci virgula seu intercisione* (Græc. διαστολὴ ἢ ὑποδιαστολὴ, Eustachio χωρισμὸς dicitur) *multa discriminant, quæ virgula respondet accentui Hebraico metheg, idque ad vitandam ambiguitatem;* ut τό, τε, et hoc. Act. xvi. 5: differt a τότε tunc. Act. xxvii. 21. Sic ὅ, τε, und der. Act. xxiii. 1. Luc. xxiii. 12: et ὅτε, quando. Luc. xi. 22: item ὅ, τι, quod relativum. Luc. x. 13: et ὅτι, quod conjunctio. Matth. xviii. 28. ἀπόδος μοι ὅ, τι ὀφείλεις. Joh. ii. 5. ὅ, τι ἂν λέγῃ ὑμῖν ποιήσατε, quicquid dixerit vobis, facite.

137. *Sæpe accentus vocabula non distinguit, quorum discrimen ex serie orationis et analysi Logica eruendum est.* Qualia sunt, οὗ, ubi, et οὗ, cujus: ἦτε, eratis, et ἥτε, sitis: ἐρευνᾶτε, investigatis, et ἐρευνᾰ̃τε, investigate. Joh. v. 39: γινώσκουσι, cognoscunt, et Rom. vii. 1. γινώσκουσι, cognoscentibus. Deut. xxviii. 57. ἐν τῇ θλίψει (dat. singul.) ᾗ θλίψει (3 sing. fut. 1 act. indic.) σὲ ὁ ἐχθρός σου: πείσομαι, persuadebo, et πείσομαι, patiar. Joh. xvii. 6. σοὶ ἦσαν, utrum hic σοὶ sit dativus a σὺ, vel nom. plur. a σός. Hebræi di-

cunt לְךָ הָיוּ. Sic Rom. xii. 19. ἐμοὶ ἡ ἐκδίκησις, pro ἐμὴ ἡ ἐκδίκησις. Hebraismus idem: ἡ πόσις, εως, potio, et ὁ πόσις, εος, maritus: μὴν, tamen, et μὴν, ηνὸς, mensis.

Sæpe utrolibet modo tempora, quæ coincidere dicuntur, accipere licet. Verbi gratia, perinde est, utrum dicas εἶπω esse a. 1 vel 2 act. sub. Joh. xii. 10. ἀποκτείνωσιν, utrum sit a. 1 act. subj. vel præs. act. subj.: γέγραφα, utrum sit præteriti activi vel medii.

Nonnunquam distinguit significatio; ut ἔστησαν, stiterunt. Act. i. 23: et ἔστησαν, steterunt. Luc. xvii. 12: quorum illud esse a. 1 act. hoc vero a. 2 act. ostendit significatio. Sic τρύγητος, ου, ὁ, vindemia, fructuum collectio: τρυγητὸς, οῦ, ὁ, vero tempus vindemiæ. At ἀμητὸς, οῦ, ὁ, messis tempus, sed ἄμητος, ου, ὁ, messis.

Sæpe genus distinguit; ut ἅλς, ἁλὸς, ὁ, sal: ἅλς, ἁλὸς, ἡ, mare: βάτος, ου, ἡ, rubus: βάτος, ου, ὁ, mensura liquidorum. *Vocalis;* ut νῶτος, ου, ὁ, dorsum: νότος, ου, ὁ, notus, ventus. *Consona;* ut νόθος, ου, ὁ, spurius.

138. *Ex accentu quoque quantitas syllabæ persæpe cognoscitur. V. c. omnia nomina in ιτης, non verbalia, habent penultimam longam;* ut πολίτης, ου, ὁ, civis: in plur. num. πολῖται, ῶν, οἱ, cives. Luc. ix. 14: in f. g. πολῖτις, ιδος, ἡ, civis femina. Sic νεᾶν, ᾶνος, ὁ, juvenis; νεᾶνις, ιδος, ἡ, juvencula. Ergo α in νεανίας et νεανίσκος est longum. *Similem rem explicabo.* Gen. xxvii. 11. ἐγὼ δὲ ἀνὴρ λεῖος, ego vero vir sum levis. Hic Latine discriminis caussa dicendum lēvis, non lĕvis. Nam *levis* prima longe, *smooth; levis* vero prima brevi, *light*, λεῖος, *levis* vitiose vulgo scribitur *lævis.* Nam ει in lingua Græca non mutatur in æ, sed in e vel i longum; ut πολιτεία, politia: μουσεῖον, museum. Lævus vere per æ a Græco λαιὸς, idem et quod *sinister.*

139. *Ex origine plurimarum vocum tam orthographia, quam prosodia sponte emergit, primoque intuitu dignosci potest.* V. g. scribendum esse κίνδυνος, periculum, compositio ostendit. Sic enim dicitur q. κινεῖν δυνάμενος, movere valens, vel q. κυνεῖν ὀδύνας, ciens dolores: ῥᾴθυμος, piger, ex ῥᾴδιος, et θυμὸς, facilis seu dissolutus animus. Sic dicimus αὕτη, pro ἡ αὐτὴ, hæc: τούτου, q. τοῦ αὐτοῦ, οὗτος q. οἱ αὐτοί. Sic θησαυρὸς, παρὰ τὸ τεθῆναι εἰς αὔριον. Sic scribendum Latine *cœmeterium,* ex κοιμητήριον, non cum vulgo *cœmiterium,* h. e. *cubile,* vel *dormitorium:* prout eleganter per metaph. *sepulcretum Christianorum* vocatur Es. lvii. 6.

140. *Dialectus quandoque tam spiritum, quam accentum mutat;* ut ὅμοιος, similis, Attice ὁμοῖος: item ἑτοῖμος, ἕτοιμος, paratus: γέλοιος, γελοῖος, ridiculus. Apoc. vi. 14. εἱλισσόμενος, pro εἰλισσόμενος, convolutus, Æolice. Æoles enim fugiunt aspirationem, quamvis hic dissentiat editio Stephani et Plantiniana. Sic superiores Germani dicunt heiſchen, sed in inferiori Germania eiſchen,

omissa litera ϧ. Sic Hebr. xi. 21. ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ ϛ pro αὐτοῦ; qui Æolismus, seu quæ pronomnis relativi ἐναλλαγὴ, in primis Græcis interpretibus, quos LXX. vocant, est admodum frequens. Sic Dores pro γράψω scribunt γραψῶ.

141. *Apostrophus quoque tenues literas mutat in aspiratas, et accentum aut tollit, aut revocat, aut relinquit:* ut Act. ix. 31. καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας, per totam Judæam. Hic α in κατὰ tollitur, et τ mutatur in θ, propter sequentem vocalem aspiratam. 1 Cor. xv. 33. φθείρουσιν ἤθη χρῆσθ' ὁμιλίαι κακαὶ, corrumpunt bonos mores colloquia prava. χρῆσθ' pro χρηστὰ, ubi τ mutatur in θ, et accentus non tantum revocatur in penultimam, sed etiam mutatur, nempe gravis in circumflexum, quod tamen in nonnullis negatur. Sic νύχθ' ὅλην, totam noctem; pro quo Luc. v. 5. δι' ὅλης τῆς νυκτὸς, per totam noctem, ubi accentus in υ manet. πόλλ' ἔχω, multa habeo: ἅπαντα τῷ πλούτῳ ἔσθ' ὑπήκοα, omnia divitiis obtemperant: δεῖν' ἔπαθον, gravia passus sum, pro δεινά. Vides, cum vocalis acuto accentu notata per ἀπόστροφον abjicitur, in *dictionibus indeclinabilibus accentum* una cum vocali *abjici:* in *declinabilibus* autem *accentum* vel *relinqui* loco suo, vel *transferri* ad syllabam præcedentem.

142. Sed hic obiter moneo, *Apostrophum* persæpe non esse, ubi esse possit, idque more Ionum: ut Luc. xv. 6. ἐπὶ ἐνὶ, pro ἐφ' ἑνί. Rom. ii. 2. κατὰ ἀλήθειαν. Rom. iii. 5. κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω. Rom. xiv. 15. οὐκ ἔτι κατὰ ἀγάπην περιπατεῖς, non jam secundum charitatem incedis. Rom. xvi. 25. et Gal. ii. 2. κατὰ, pro κατ' ἀποκάλυψιν, ex revelatione.

Hactenus *de encliticarum dictionum accentibus* fuse dixi. Ne tamen aliquis tiro tot regularum congerie absterritus, hanc de accentibus institutionem declinet, ad tres regulas sequentes ferme omnia de dictionibus encliticis sum contracturus.

REGULA I.

Dictio enclitica qualiscunque post vocabulum προπαροξύτονον et προπερισπώμενον *reponit seu transfert accentum suum:* ut Joh. xxi. 7. ὁ Κύριός ἐστι, dominus est. Joh. xx. 1. ἦραν τὸν Κύριόν μου, abstulerunt dominum meum. Matth. xi. 29. πρ�ΰς εἰμι, mitis sum. Act. vii. 59. πνεῦμά μου, spiritus meus.

REGULA II.

Post vocabulum ὀξύτονον et περισπώμενον *amittit accentum suum;* ut Matth. xxviii. 20. μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι, vobiscum sum. Act. xvi. 9. ἀνήρ τις, vir quidam. Joh. xxi. 16. ἀγαπᾷς με; diligis me?

REGULA III.

Post vocabulum penacutum seu παροξύτονον dictio enclitica monosyllaba amittit accentum, dissyllaba vero suum retinet, ut Rom. xiv. 23. *πᾶν ὃ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως, ἁμαρτία ἐστὶ*, quicquid non est ex fide, peccatum est. Rom. i. 11. *ἵνα τι μεταδῶ*, ut quid impertiar. Hic *τι* amittit accentum suum post vocem penacutam.

C. A. KLOTZII

LIBELLUS DE FELICI AUDACIA HORATII.

No. II.—Continued from No. XXVI. p. 305.

AUDACES sententias maxime carmen commendare et ornare, satis notum est. Quis ignorat hæc Longini, *S.* 8. *πρῶτον μὲν καὶ κράτιστον τὸ περὶ τὰς νοήσεις ἀδρεπήβολον*, aut illud Quintiliani, *Sententiarum optimum quamque a periculo peti?* Quas vero dicimus audaces sententias? nempe eas, quæ humanæ naturæ imbecillitatem quasi superare videntur, quæ ex animo magno et nobili profectæ ne capi quidem possunt ab abjecto et humili, quæ auditorem aut lectorem attollunt, ut sese quasi grandior fiat, quæ non tam nobis persuadent, quam potius in admirationem nos rapiunt. Optimi magistri Longini verba adscribamus. Hic et in *S.* 1. *οὐ γὰρ εἰς πειθὼ τοὺς ἀκροωμένους, ἀλλ' εἰς ἔκστασιν ἄγει τὰ ὑπερφυᾶ*, et in *S.* 7. inquit: *πρὸς μεγαλοφροσύνην τὴν ψυχὴν συνδιατιθῇ, καὶ ἐγκαταλείπῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ πλεῖον τοῦ λεγομένου τὸ ἀναθεωρούμενον.* Dicamus illud audax esse, de quo idem dicere possis quod Seneca *Suas.* i. 1. *Id demum magnificum esse in oratione, quod diu contempleris, neque tamen in majus attollere possis.* Ejusmodi nobiles sententias a magnis viris pronunciatas historiarum monimentis consignatas legimus multas. Græcia in primis olim et Roma audivit tales complures. Quis non extollitur animo, si Mucium illum ad Porsennam dicere: *Et facere et pati fortia Romanum est,* aut Alexandrum Parmenioni de defendendis impedimentis scisciitanti respondere audit: *Me et Philippo patre dignum est contemto sarcinarum damno fortiter dimicare.* Vide, quam humili verbo utatur. *Sarcinas* appellat impedimenta omnemque supellectilem. Sed exscribendi essent veteres auctores, si exempla cumulare vellemus. Maneamus in Horatii carminibus. Hic vero animum nostrum ad se rapit nobilis illa sententia, iii. 3. de viro justo et virtute prædito: *Si fractus illabatur orbis Impavidum ferient ruinæ:* quæ sublimitas! quæ imago! Vir justus et constans non movetur furore civium, non minis sævi tyranni: turbet et misceat auster mare, tranquillus erit: tonet et fulminet cœlum, idem erit: nutet denique cœlum et ruinam minetur, concutiatur terra, impavidus hanc ruinam intuebitur, impavidus et suus obruetur. Quid vero magnificentius dici potest? quæ sententia potest esse audacior? Imitatus est hunc locum ex recentioribus Hier. Angerianus in *Erotopægn. p.* 217.

Conscia mens recti fida est custodia, dumque
Nil obsim, mea quo membra pavore trement?
Tota ruat cœli moles, non terreor: ipsa,
Ipsa ruant in me fulmina, lætus ero.

Oratione vero eandem sententiam expressit Dan. Heinsius, cujus orationes, quæ maximam sententiarum nobilitatem cum summo verborum splendore conjunctam exhibent, etiam atque etiam eloquentiæ studiosis commendamus, in *orat. de Stoica Philos. p.* 373. *Calamitates omnes undique invadant, paupertas opprimat, opes deficiant, dolor machinas admoveat, terra cælo misceatur, cælum sibi aut in caput sapientis cadat, immotus animo et inconcussus, suæ voluntatis conscius ac potens, divina autem fretus, vitam, quam in summa semper egit tranquillitate Deo suo vel donabit, vel reddet.* Nec pœnitet similem locum adscribere ex Æschylo, quo poeta ita delector ut nullo alio, *Prometh. v.* 991. *ῥιπτέσθω μὲν αἰθαλοῦσα φλόξ, Λευκοπτέρῳ δὲ νιφάδι καὶ βρυντήμασι Χθονίοις κυκάτω πάντα, καὶ ταρασσέτω. Ὑράμψει γὰρ οὐδὲν τῶνδέ μ' ὥστε κ. λ.* Qualia vero tibi videntur hæc apud Achillem Tatium, i. vi. 405. *Τὰς βασάνους παράστησον, φερέτω τροχόν· ἰδοὺ χεῖρες, τεινέτω· φερέτω μάστιγας· ἰδοὺ νῶτος, τυπτέτω· κομιζέτω πῦρ, ἰδοὺ σῶμα, καιέτω· φερέτω καὶ σίδηρον· ἰδοὺ δέρη, σφαζέτω.* Quid potest præstantius dici? non inutile profecto erit, comparare inter se similia veterum loca. Quare nos etiam adscribemus et indicabimus loca, quæ in veterum atque recentiorum auctorum libris observavimus. Porro idem magnus animus, eadem in magnis cogitationibus audacia apparet e i. 22. ubi integrum vitæ scelerisque purum sine telis, arcu et jaculis per syrtes et Caucasum iturum esse dicit, et iii. 29. ubi fortunæ quasi bellum indicit, et levem hanc meretriculam vincit: *Si celeres quatit Pennas resigno, quæ dedit, et mea Virtute me involvo.* Parvi se ait æstimare munera et favorem fortunæ; sin, quæ dederit, iterum sibi velit eripere, se lubenter esse omnia redditurum: retinere se tamen semper virtutem: hujus conscientiam sibi a fortuna eripi non posse: hac sese tanquam veste munire, qua involutum se fortunæ lusus irridere. Videtur fere mihi traxisse hoc *involvo virtute* Horatius e Græco sermone. Memini certe Aristidem *T. I. p.* 72. dicere: *ἀμφιεσαμένη πολλὴν αἰδὼ*, et Ælianum V. H. vii. 9. dicere: *ἠμπείχετο τῇ σωφροσύνῃ.* Etiam pater poetarum aliquoties: *ἀναιδείην ἐπειμένε.* Quam loquendi rationem etiam Latini adoptaverunt, ut Tacitus *Annal.* xi. 45. *animum bonis artibus induerat.* Sed video, jam plura e Latinis scriptoribus exempla attulisse Burmannum ad Petron. p. 25. edit. alter. Eodem animo, quo illa, i. 31. rejicit Horatius omnes opes et divitias, non orat Apollinem Sardiniæ segetes, non aurum aut ebur Indicum, non magna rura. Libere fatetur ii. 18. *Non ebur neque aureum Mea renidet in domo lacunar—At fides et ingeni Benigna vena est.* Quæ fortasse expressit ex Bachylide p. 285. *Οὐ βοῶν πάρεστι σώματ' οὔτε χρυσὸς, οὔτε πορφύρεοι τάπητες, ἀλλὰ θυμὸς εὐμενὴς, μοῦσά τε γλυκεῖα κ. λ.* Divitias etiam et splendorem iii. 1. nihil ait conferre ad dolorem animi minuendum. Se malle ea contemnere: nolle se, qua delectetur, vallem Sabinam relinquere, ut majores opes consequatur.

Tum iii. 3. ubi digna illa Romano cive sententia occurrit: *dulce et decorum est pro patria mori*, tam vere, quam sublimiter dicit: virtutem non repulsam pati, eamque non honoribus fulgere, qui a voluntate plebis dependeant: dignitatem illius non contaminari posse, sed esse semper puram: virtutem suis cœlum aperire et immortalitatem donare: ubi obiter notamus, illos versus: *Vetabo, qui Cereris sacrum Vulgarit arcanæ, sub iisdem Sit trabibus etc.* videri mihi ductos e Callimacho, *hymn. in Cerer.* v. 117. Δάματερ, μὴ τῆνος ἐμὶν φίλος, ὅς τοι ἀπεχθὴς Εἴη, μηδ' ὁμότοιχος ἐμοὶ κακογείτονες ἐχθροί. Adde Æschylum *in Sept. c. Theb.* v. 605. ubi Horatianum, *solvat phaselum*, bene illustrari potest illo: Ἦ γὰρ ξυνεισβὰς πλοῖον εὐσεβὴς ἀνὴρ Ναύταισι θερμοῖς καὶ πανυργίᾳ τινὶ, Ὅλωλεν ἀνδρῶν σὺν θεοπτύστῳ γένει. Denique quam magnifica hæc: iii. 16. se divitias non curare, seque, dum illas contemnat, ditiorem sibi videri majoremque, quam, si quicquid Appulus aret, suis horreis occultare dicatur: iii. 24. avaritiam esse omnium malorum fontem: dimittendam esse illam pectore: amorem opum ejurandum, et divitias abjiciendas, *nos in mare proximum Gemmas, et lapides, aurum et inutile Mittamus:* iii. 29. non suum esse, precari, si procellæ oriantur, ut dii navibus suis parcant: se talia non curare: illum tantum lætum vivere et sui potentem, cui liceat quotidie dicere: Hunc diem bene transegi: fortuna in transacta nullum jus habet, non irrita facere potest præclara mea facta: nihil amplius desidero: moliatur et machinetur fortuna, quodcunque velit: *Vivi.* iv. 9. dicit Lollium esse consulem, sed non consulem unius anni, verum omni tempore, quo virtutem suam exerceat: consulatum unius anni spatio terminari: Lollium consulem esse, quoties utili honestum præferat: neque enim ab honoribus virtutis dignitatem dependere: solum illum esse consulem, qui contemnat opes et divitias et effrenatas cupiditates coerceat: hunc esse consulari animo præditum. Recte enim sic, si quid judico, explicarunt viri docti hunc locum, a quibus male dissentit Dacierius. ii. 2. nobilis est descriptio viri, qui libidinem et cupiditates, immo qui se ipsum vincat. Hunc præponit poeta totius orbis terrarum victori, hujus imperium maximo regno majus esse dicit. *Latius regnes avidum domando Spiritum, quam si Lybiam remotis Gadibus jungas et uterque Pœnus Serviat uni:* virtutem, quæ non, ut stulta plebs, sentiat, minime Phrahaten, pessimum tyrannum, ad beatos et felices referre, sed hoc nomine eos ornare, qui magno animo divitias spreverint. *Quisquis ingentes oculo irretorto Spectat acervos*, quorum in interpretatione quoniam dissentire videmus viros doctos, nostram quoque dicemus sententiam. Clericus quidem in *Arte Critica*, i. 2. 11. interpretatur locum per oculos abstinentes et qui omnino nihil intelligant. Heumannus vero in *Parergis Criticis* cum aliis Horatium dixisse censet, quisquis ingentes aliorum opes sine invidia intuetur. Insunt in his quædam, sed non insunt omnia. Horatius pingit hominem, tanta constantia atque fortitudine animi, ut magnum auri argentique acervum adspiciens, ne oculos quidem detorqueat. Nam ad magnum splendorem, ut solis, aut connivemus, aut dejicimus oculos, et ab adspectu rei, quam horremus aut timemus, avertimus oculos. Hic vero vir ne timet quidem, ne, si adspiciat

aurum, cupiditate illius accendatur: ideo magno animo illud intuetur: non dejicit oculos, non detorquet, quo minus hoc splendore perstringantur. Hac fortitudine nulla major cogitari potest. Quemadmodum, qui pulchram mulierculam rectis oculis adspicit atque amorem, blanditias et illecebras torvo vultu contemnit, fortior est eo, qui non aliter ex hoc certamine superiorem se discessurum esse sentit, quam si aut abeat, aut certe non intueatur illam pulchritudinem: ita etiam ille, qui opes videns non tamen earum splendore percellitur, major est eo, qui ad sustinendum hunc contemtum animumque firmandum eas ab oculis removeat. Hæc mihi vera videtur hujus loci interpretatio. Ejusmodi igitur sententiæ nobiles sunt, magnæ, et dignæ Romano, qui se victorem totius orbis terrarum meminit, qui divitias a se contemni debere, non amari, sibi persuasit. Hæ nobis sublimem et nobilem Romani poetæ animum depingunt. Nam ut bene dicit Longinus *S.* 9. *τὸ τοιοῦτον ὕψος μεγαλοφροσύνης ἀπήχημα.* Quemadmodum enim præclaræ et sublimes sententiæ ab animo humili, admiratore divitiarum, opum amatore, adulatore, ne capi quidem possunt: ita neque ab ullo alio, nisi magno animo proficiscuntur. Recte monet, quem nunquam satis laudare possumus, Longinus, *S.* 9. *ὥς ἔχειν δεῖ τὸν ἀληθῆ ῥήτορα μὴ ταπεινὸν φρόνημα,* et eodem loco: *εἰς τοὺς μάλιστα φρονηματίας ἐμπίπτει τὰ ὑπερφυᾶ.* Non minus elegans dicendi magister Quintilianus, *Maxima, ait, pars eloquentiæ constat animo,—qui quo generosior celsiorque est, hoc majoribus velut organis commovetur.*

Ad audaces has sententias refero etiam ea loca, ubi Horatius plenus furore ipsam æternitatem spectat, suum nomen aureis litteris omnis ævi annalibus impressum intuetur, suaque carmina ab omni posteritate, ab omnibus populis legi videt. His cogitationibus plenus dicit iii. 30. *Exegi monimentum ære perennius—Dicar, qua violens obstrepit Aufidus etc. usque ego postera Crescam laude recens.* Et ii. 20. se quasi cygnum, non usitata nec tenui ferri per æthera penna videt, atque vaticinans addit: *Me Colchus et qui dissimulat metum Marsæ cohortis Dacus et ultimi Noscent Geloni: me peritus Discet Iber Rhodanique potor.* Quæ quidem Horatiana ita imitatus est Muretus ii. 9.

> Non te Parca feret totum, non totus obibis,
> Parsque tui effugiet ferales optima flammas.
> Musa suos vetat ipsa mori, dat vivere Musa
> Perpetuo, et famam memorem per secla propagat,

adde Callim. ep. 2.

> Αἱ δὲ τεαὶ ζώουσιν ἀηδόνες, ᾗσιν ὁ πάντων
> Ἅρπακτὴρ ἀΐδης οὐκ ἐπὶ χεῖρα βαλεῖ,

quæ sententia apud Pindarum sæpius occurrit. Huc etiam pertinent illa iv. 9. *Ne forte credas interitura etc.* Atque profecto magnum est aliquid, omnem posteritatem suorum operum admiratorem videre, sibique ipsam immortalitatem nominis et perpetuam gloriam spondere. Tales cogitationes non nisi a magnis hominibus concipiuntur, et qui earum capaces sunt, non possunt non præclara opera et excellentia

proferre. Verissime enim ait Longinus, *S.* 14. *εἰ δέ τις αὐτόθεν φοβοῖτο, μὴ τοῦ ἰδίου βίου καὶ χρόνου οὐ φθέγξαιτό τι ὑπερήμερον, ἀνάγκη καὶ τὰ συλλαμβανόμενα ὑπὸ τῆς τούτου ψυχῆς ἀτελῆ καὶ τυφλὰ, ὥσπερ ἀμβλοῦσθαι, πρὸς τὸν τῆς ὑστεροφημίας ὅλης μὴ τελεσφορούμενα χρόνον.* adde, quæ copiose et præclare de hac re disputat Dacierius ad ii. 20. Conscius sibi est præclarus auctor præstantiæ suæ, et quas se mereri laudes judicat, a sapienti posteritate sibi quoque tribui videt. Eandem nobilem de se opinionem declarat i. 1. ubi gelidum nemus jactat, seque Deis misceri superis ait; i. 17. ubi Musam suam Deis cordi esse dicit: ii. 7. ubi ipsum Mercurium fingit, defensorem doctorum virorum et poetarum, se prælio et periculis eripuisse: ii. 17. ubi, cum ab arbore prope occisus fuisset, narrat sibi Faunum opem tulisse, ictumque levasse dextra: adde iii. 4. et 18. atque iv. 6. *Nupta jam dices: ego Dis amicum Reddidi carmen docilis modorum Vatis Horati,* quem locum pulchre imitatus est Huetius p. 122. *ed. Oliv.*

> Servabunt numeros nostraque concinent
> Mistæ cum pueris carmina virgines,
> Formoso dociles reddere pollice
> Cantus vatis Huetii.

Sunt vero apud utriusque linguæ poetas multa loca, his simillima, ubi ipsi suas laudes prædicant, sibique gloriam et famam prædicunt. Plurima exempla leguntur in carminibus Pindari, ut: *Ol.* i. *Εἰη σέ τε τοῦτον ὑψοῦ χρόνον πατεῖν, ἐμέ τε τοσσάδε νικαφόροις ὁμιλεῖν, πρόφαντον σοφίᾳ καθ' Ἕλλανας ἐόντα πάντα.* iii. *Μοῖσα δ' οὕτω τοι παρέστα μοι νεοσίγαλον εὑρόντι τρόπον Δωρίῳ φωνὰν ἐναρμόξαι πεδίλῳ ἀγλαόκωμον.* iv. *Ζεῦ, τεαὶ γὰρ ὧραι—μ' ἔπεμψαν ὑψηλοτάτων μάρτυρ' ἀέθλων.* vi. *Δόξαν ἔχω τιν' ἐπὶ γλώσσᾳ ἀκόνας λιγυρᾶς κ. λ.* et minime obscure vii. *Καὶ ἐγὼ νέκταρ χυτὸν Μοισᾶν δόσιν ἀθλοφόροις ἀνδράσιν πέμπων,* atque x. *Μέλιτι δ' εὐάνορα πόλιν καταβρέχων—αἴνησα.* Et sic ille sæpius. Neque hæc exscripsissem, nisi optimi poetæ lectionem nostra ætate negligi scirem. Quam magnifice Statius de se senserit et locutus sit, multis exemplis ostendit Barthius *ad Theb.* iv. 37. Et qualia tibi videntur hæc Propertii, iii. 1.

> Meque inter seros laudabit Roma nepotes:
> Illum post cineres auguror esse diem.
> Ne mea contemto lapis indicet ossa sepulchro,
> Provisum est Lycio vota probante deo.

aut illa Ovidii, *Tr.* iii. 7. 19.

> Quilibet hanc sævo vitam mihi finiat ense;
> Me tamen exstincto fama superstes erit.
> Dumque suis victrix omnem de montibus orbem
> Prospiciet domitum Martia Roma, legar.

aut ista, *Tr.* ii. 115.

> Sit quoque nostra domus vel censu parva, vel ortu,
> Ingenio certe non latet illa meo.
> Quo videar quamvis nimium juveniliter usus,
> Grande tamen toto nomen ab orbe fero.

Turbaque doctorum Nasonem novit et audet
Non fastiditis adnumerare viris.

Et *Amor.* iii. 15.

Pelignæ dicar gloria gentis ego.
Atque aliquis spectans hospes Sulmonis aquosi
Mœnia, quæ campi jugera pauca tenent,
Quæ tantum, dicet, potuistis ferre poetam,
Quantulacumque estis, vos ego magna voco.

et *Amor.* i. 15. 41.

Ergo etiam, cum me supremus adederit ignis,
Vivam: parsque mei multa superstes erit.

Talia exempla occurrunt plura apud poetas, quæ facile potuissemus in medium proferre, si libuisset. Erat enim nobis olim persuasum, eum, qui se humanitatis litteris operam dare dicat, non legere, sed ediscere debere veteres poetas.

Sed reliqua videamus. Audax inprimis noster est in laudando Augusto et Romani populi majestate describenda. Sic, ut bene Dacierius observavit, audacter i. 2. dicit, morte Cæsaris totam naturam commotam fuisse: inde Jovem fulminasse: inde grandinem et nivem venisse. Mercurium demissum esse cœlo ad ulciscendam Cæsaris necem, tantumque scelus ulciscendum: atque hunc Mercurium esse Augustum. Inde addit: *Serus in cœlum redeas:* nempe, tu, Auguste, non homo, non mortalis es, sed deus, sed Mercurius, qui cœlo ad aliquod tempus tantum descendisti. Eandem sublimitatem recte idem Dacierius tribuit i. 12. ubi poeta dicit, fata destinasse, ut Jupiter Augusti curam gereret: hunc Augustum cum Jove divisum imperium habiturum esse: Augustum solo Jove secundum in terra esse regnaturum, Jovique relicturum fulmen et tonitru. Magnificentius profecto et sublimius princeps laudari non poterat. Quantum enim hoc est? hunc regem solo Jove minorem esse: cum hoc Jovem totius orbis imperium divisisse, sibique cœli tantummodo imperium retinuisse? Idem dicit iii. 5. duo esse deos et Joves: unum cœlo tonantem regnare, alterum præsentem in terris esse Augustum, et iv. 14. ubi Augustum ait quasi terrestrem deum a Romanis coli: *Te multa prece, te prosequitur mero etc.* Porro iv. 2. ita laudat Augustum, ut nihil majus cogitari possit. Nam licet aurea ætate, quam poetæ fingebant, omnia excellentissima fuerint, ipsa tamen illa aurea tempora non præstantiorem principem donare posse dicit. Si nobiscum reputamus, quam de aurea ætate veteres habuerint opinionem, quam perfecta et absoluta omnia ea fuisse existimaverint, tum vero videbimus, quam audacter dicta sint hæc:

Quo nihil majus meliusve terris
Fata donavere, bonique divi.
Nec dabunt, quamvis redeant in aurum
Tempora priscum.

Ubi etiam notabis: non solum maximum principem vocari Augustum, sed etiam optimum, quæ duæ virtutes conjunctæ summum principem

omnibusque partibus absolutum reddunt. Quam sententiam ita expressit Johannes Secundus, p. 152.

Quo mitius clementiusque
Nil dederuntve dabuntve secla:
Non si recurrant tempora, quæ Jovis
Ferunt parentem falciferum senem
Rexisse, cum fides sororque
Justa pio superesset orbi.

Hisce enim versibus elegantissimus poeta, cujus lectionem commendamus etiam atque etiam, idem indicat, quod Horatius. Paulo aliter Eumenius paneg. pro restaur. Schol. *c.* 18. *adeo, ut res est, aurea illa secula, quæ non diu quondam Saturno rege viguerunt, nunc æternis auspiciis Jovis et Herculis renascuntur.* Eadem sententia est iv. 5. ubi Augusti vultum, quasi solem, omnia exhilarare et noctis tenebras dispellere ait. Illius absentia tristem quasi hiemem esse Romæ: si redeat Augustus, redire ver et cœli serenitatem.

Lucem redde tuæ, dux bone, patriæ:
Instar veris enim vultus ubi tuus
Affulsit populo, gratior it dies
Et soles melius nitent.

Hæc ultima præsertim plena sunt venustatis. Ita etiam mulier apud Æschylum *Pers.* 300. postquam Xerxem adhuc vivere audivit, ait: Ἐμοῖς μὲν εἶπας δώμασιν φάος μέγα Καὶ λευκὸν ἦμαρ νυκτὸς ἐκ μελαγχίμου, et Euripid. *Orest.* 243. de Menelao adveniente: Ἥκει φῶς ἐμοῖς καὶ σοῖς κακοῖς. Hunc locum idem Secundus imitatus est sic p. 156.

— Serena est reddita patriæ
Vultu tuo lux et videntur
Ire dies meliore sole, etc.

Magnificis his Augusti laudibus adde iv. 14. Inter audaces vero de Romano imperio sententias eminet ii. 1.

Juno et deorum quisquis amicior
Afris, inulta cesserat impotens
Tellure.

Juno, Neptunus, Pallas amabant præ aliis terris Africam, atque inprimis Juno Carthaginem *terris magis omnibus unam* colebat et amabat. Jam Romani hanc urbem evertebant et destruebant. Impotens Juno dilectam urbem non potuit defendere, immo ne tum quidem ulcisci hanc injuriam, eversione urbis sibi illatam. Scipio igitur major Deis, Romani potentiores erant Junone. Sed quo magis hanc sententiam considero, eo minus mihi illa probanda videtur. Nam dum poeta Romanorum potestatem ipsis diis superiorem esse dicit, dum Junonem cedere debuisse inquit, impius videtur erga deos. Tum vero hæc sententia non magis probanda est, quam illa Lucani:

Victrix causa Deis placuit, sed victa Catoni,

de qua quid viri docti sentiant, notum est. Verum judicent de hoc alii. Non minus audacter iii. 3. ipsam Junonis orationem ponit de Romani imperii majestate. Quam magnifica hæc:

Stet Capitolium fulgens:

fore, ut Roma cum terrore maximo nomen in ultimas orbis regiones extendat: illam armis victuram esse omnes populos:

Quicunque mundi terminus obstitit,
Hunc tangat armis etc.

Sunt denique plurimæ audaces sententiæ in carminibus Horatii, quibus cum depingantur quasi res, possis etiam eas *imagines* dicere; [*Imagines.*]

nos eas referemus ad sententias. Sic magnifica sunt, quæ iii. 5. de Regulo dicit. Regulus in senatu suasit, ne captivi redderentur, et tum ad Carthaginienses redire cupit. Novit, quæ sibi parata sint, neque tamen mutat consilium. Amici et propinqui illum retinere cupiunt: populus obstat et retinet. Regulus obstantem catervam *dimovet* abitque, et quidem eo vultu, quasi molesta clientis alicujus lite transacta in villam abiret, quasi animi oblectandi causa et recreandi. *Tenderet Venafranos in agros.* Tanta ex vultu lætitia eminet, tanta est frontis serenitas. Non poterat profecto vir fortis et Romanus melius depingi. Similiter Ovidius de Hercule in rogo posito: *Met.* ix. 236.

Haud alio vultu, quam si conviva jaceret
Inter plena meri redimitus pocula sertis.

ii. 1. de Catone dicit:

Et cuncta terrarum subacta
Præter atrocem animum Catonis.

Unus homo vinci non potuit. Cæsar totum terrarum orbem superaverat, copias hostium profligaverat, vicerat omnia: solus Cato humana sorte exemtus est: liber vixit, liber animam reddidit. iv. 13. Dum pulchritudinem describere cupit, audaci sententia Cupidinem in genis virginis sedem sibi collocasse ait:

Ille virentis et
Doctæ psallere Chiæ
Pulchris excubat in genis.

Similem formulam ex Sophocle attulerunt interpretes: nos laudabimus aliquot ex aliis. In Anthol. vet. Epigr. *T. I.* p. 646.

O blandos oculos et inquietos,
Et quadam propria nota loquaces,
Illic et Venus et leves Amores
Atque ipsa in medio sedet Voluptas,

ubi vide Burmannum, et in *Addend.* p. 746. Similiter Johannes Secundus, p. 111.

Quot blandæ Veneres, quotque Cupidines,
Et labella pererrant,
Et genas roseas tuas.

et Marullus, p. 88.

Amorem ocellis insidentem fulgidis
Vidi —
Charitesque circum et Dionem aurcam
Spretis Cytheris dulcibus.

Paria habet dulcissimus Anacreon, p. 152. Τρυφεροῦ δ' ἔσω γενείου περὶ λυγδίνῳ τραχήλῳ χάριτες πέτοιντο πᾶσαι. Et quomodo placent illa Pindari *Nem.* viii. Ὥρα πότνια—ἅτε παρθενίοισι καὶ παίδων τ' ἐφίζουσα βλεφάροις. Alio quidem modo, mollissime tamen atque, ut nihil venustius esse possit, Ibycus dicit p. 90. Εὐρύαλε γλαυκέων χαρίτων θάλος καλλικόμων μελέδημα σὲ μὲν Κύπρις ἄτ' ἀγανοβλέφαρος Πειθὼ ῥοδέοισιν ἐν ἄνθεσι θρέψαν. Non minus jucunda et audax sententia est i. 2. *Erycina ridens, Quam Jocus circumvolat et Cupido.* Pulchrum est certe, Joco et Cupidini alas tributas esse. Locum imitatus est Marullus, p. 35.

> Tuque o quæ Cnidon incolis Paphumque,
> Piscoso Dea procreata ponto,
> Quam circumsiliunt Jocusque Amorque
> Et passis Charites comis decentes etc.

Illud vero *ridens* ductum est a Græcorum φιλομμειδὴς Ἀφροδίτη. vide Spanhem. *ad Callim.* p. 225. add. Sappho p. 37. ad Venerem: τὺ δ' ὦ μάκαιρα Μειδιαίσασ' ἀθανάτῳ προσώπῳ, et sic sæpius poetæ Latini. Noster infra iii. 27. *Perfidum ridens;* et Ovid. *Met.* xi. 329. de judicio Paridis: *tum pueris dulce arridens.* Plura habet Heinsius ad *Ov. Met.* x. 558. Verum quemadmodum Joco et Cupidini Horatium alas dedisse vidimus, ita etiam audacius eas fato ii. 17. *volucrisque fati Tardavit alas,* et curis datas esse videmus. ii. 16. *curas laqueata circum Tecta volantes;* quem locum belle suum fecit Johannes Secundus in descriptione regiæ pecuniæ, p. 244.

> At circum auratasque trabes auratæque tecta,
> Aureaque insomnes circum laquearia curæ
> Stridentes agitant pennas examine longo.

Quid vero de eo dicas, quod poeta curam quasi Deam inducit, quæ semper hominem comitetur, quæ eundem locum petat, quem ille, quæ cum illo navim ascendat, quæ, si equo vehatur, post tergum sedeat? *Post equitem sedet atra cura.* iii. 2. Pœnæ, quasi homini, dat pedes: *Deseruit pede Pœna claudo,* atque etiam morti: i. 4. *Pallida mors æquo pulsat pede pauperum tabernas Regumque turres:* i. 3. morbos ut exercitum describit, qui terram aliquam occupet atque castra ibi ponat: *Macies et nova febrium Terris incubuit cohors.* Sic Æschylus *Suppl.* 692. νούσων δ' ἐσμὸς ἀπ' ἀστῶν ἴζοι κράτους ἀτερπής. i. 35. dicit gladios bellis civilibus retusos, eorumque aciem corporibus civium hebetatam esse: inde orat fortunam, cujus comitatum magnifice describit. i. 35. ut illos iterum acuat, ut Romani iis contra hostes imperii uti possint.

> — O utinam! nova
> Incude diffingas retusum in
> Massagetas Arabasque ferrum.

Similiter Æschylus in *Choeph.* 646. προσχαλκεύει δ' αἶσα φασγανουργὸς, et Noster iv. 5. de ira: *non ira quæ procudit enses Et miseras inimicat urbes.* Si amorem, quo accensus est, exprimere conatur, duabus utitur audacissimis sententiis. i. 19. *In me tota ruens Venus Cyprum deseruit.* Quæ sententia! Venus reliquit dilectam sibi

insulam, in qua sedem sibi collocavit, atque meum pectus intravit: in meo corpore domicilium posuit: me delubrum suum fecit. At iv. 13. indicat amorem, quo olim Lycen prosecutus erat sic: *Quæ spirabat amores, quæ me surpuerat mihi.* Se dicit non amplius suum, sed Lyces, fuisse, atque ab hac se sibi ipsum subreptum. Hoc ex fonte multi summum leporem in carmina sua derivaverunt, ut exemplis laudatis docet Burmannus ad Anthol. i. p. 670. Nos similia aliquot adscribemus e Græcis poetis. Apollon. *Argon.* iii. de Medea, cum Jasonem vidisset: ἐκ δ' ἄρα κραδίη στηθέων πέσεν, vid. Tollius *ad Longin.* p. 81. Archilochus p. 380. Τοῖος γάρ φιλότητος ἔρως ὑπὸ καρδίην ἐλυσθεὶς πολλὴν κατ' ἀχλὺν ὀμμάτων ἔχευε, κλέψας ἐκ στηθέων ἁπαλὰς φρένας. Callimachus *ep.* 32. ἔγνων, Εὐξίθεός σε συνήρπασε, et *ep.* 43. Ἥμισύ μευ ψυχῆς ἔτι τὸ πνέον, ἥμισυ δ' οὐκ οἶδ' Εἴτ' ἔρος, εἴτ' Ἀΐδης ἥρπασε· πλὴν ἀφανὲς κ. λ. Longius enim carmen est, quam ut totum huc transferri possit. Verum hæc quidem ferenda erant, sed, quæso te, quid dicas de hoc Anacreontis p. 212. Ὦ παῖ, παρθένιον βλέπων, δίζημαί σε, Σὺ δ' οὐκ ἀΐεις, οὐκ εἰδὼς ὅτι τῆς ἐμῆς ψυχῆς ἡνιοχεύεις. Multo profecto verecundius Alcman p. 336. Ἔρως με δ' αὖτε κύπριδος ἔκατι γλυκὺς κατείβων καρδίαν ἰαίνει. Sed sublimius et audacius Euripides *Orest.* 1289. Ἆρ' εἰς τὸ κάλλος ἐκκεκώφωται ξίφη, nisi hoc loco interpreteris gladios per viros gladiis armatos, et ibidem 1023. ὡς ἰδοῦσά σ' ὄμμασι—ἐξέστην φρενῶν. Denique bellissimum est hoc loco *spirare amores,* quod sic interpretor, ut apud Anacreontem, aut incerti potius nominis poetam, p. 208. Ἀπαλὴν παῖδα κατέχων κύπριν ὅλην πνέουσαν. Eodem verbo utitur Æschylus *Eumen.* 876. πνέω τοι μένος ἅπαντά τε κότον, et *Agamemn.* 1244. ἄσπιδόν τ' ἀρὰν φίλοις πνέουσαν, de Latinorum formula *spirare* v. Drakenb. *ad Sil. Ital.* xvii. 536 et Heins. *ad Ov. Met.* v. 348. Sed nescio, quomodo longius in hoc loco explicando commorati simus, quam nobis initio fuit propositum. Cupimus certe laudatis pulcherrimis Græcorum poetarum locis, et sensum pulchri acuere, et juventutem ad lectionem venustissimorum scriptorum excitare. Nunc ad alia pergamus, iii. 1. Jovis imperium et potestatem paucis verbis tam magnifice exprimit, ut augustius aliquid majusque dici nequeat. *Cuncta supercilio moventis,* quem versum ductum esse e notissimo loco Homeri κυανέῃσιν ἐπ' ὀφρύσι νεῦσε Κρονίων—μέγαν δ' ἐλέλιξεν Ὄλυμπον, alii jam notaverunt. Sed Horatianæ sententiæ major est vis; nam Jovem nutu non cœlum tantum, sed totum terrarum orbem, sed omnia concutere et movere dicit. Eadem sententia est apud Virgilium, *Æn.* x. 115. *Annuit et totum nutu tremefecit Olympum;* Ovidium, *Met.* ii. 849. *qui nutu concutit orbem:* Statium *Theb.* iii. 308. *terras cælumque fretumque Attremere oranti—vidi,* iv. 3. *Jupiter—Concussitque caput, motu quo celsa laborant Sidera, proclamatque adici cervicibus Atlas,* viii. 82. *non fortius æthera vultu Torquet et astriferos inclinat Jupiter axes,* atque similiter prope ix. 250. *leviterque oculos ad mœnia Cadmi Rettulit et viso sederunt flumina* (antea turbida) *nutu.* Sic etiam Mamertinus in *Paneg. Maximiniani,* c. 7. de Diocletiano: *verum hoc Jovis sui more, nutu illo patrio quo omnia contremiscunt,—consceptus est,* et Eumenius in *Paneg. pro restaur. Schol.* c. 15. *summi patris,*

cujus nutum promissionemque firmantis totius mundi tremor sentit. Non possum non excellentissimum etiam Arriani locum adscribere: ὅταν ἐκεῖνος (nempe Deus) εἴπῃ τοῖς φυτοῖς ἀνθεῖν, ἀνθεῖ· ὅταν εἴπῃ βλαστάνειν, βλαστάνει, ὅταν ἐκφέρειν τὸν καρπὸν, ἐκφέρει. *L.* i. c. 14. ii. 1. tantas editas fuisse dicit strages, ut ipsa maria suum colorem amiserint atque sanguine infecta et colorata sint, et aqua rubeat. Si attentius hoc tecum consideres, audacter dictum esse invenies. *Quod mare Dauniæ Non decoloravere cædes?* ita ut ii. 12. *Siculum mare Pœno purpureum sanguine.* Plura similia ex aliis exempla collegit Burmannus ad Anthologiam, i. p. 74. adde Latinum Pacatum in *Paneg.* c. 34. *spumat decolor cruore fluvius, et cunctantes meatus vix eluctatis cadaveribus evolvit etc. Epod.* 9. *cui super Carthaginem Virtus sepulchrum condidit.* Scipio, qui Carthaginem vicerat, hoc fortitudinis suæ præmium consecutus est, ut ipsa Virtus ei monimentum in ruinis eversæ urbis poneret. Addamus duo. Magnifica et sublimis est imago Jovis fulminantis i. 2. *rubente Dextera sacras jaculatus arces.* Inprimis illud *rubente* pingit nobis Deum, qui dextra fulvum fulmen teneat, cujusque dextra hujus ignis splendore rubeat. Hanc imaginem videas etiam apud Pindarum *Ol.* ix. Δία τε φοινικοστερόπαν, et *Nem.* x. 2. Ζεὺς δ' ἐπ' Ἰδᾷ πυρφόρον πλᾶξε ψολόεντα κεραυνὸν, atque Æschylum *Prometh.* 668. πυρωπὸν ἐκ Διὸς μολεῖν κεραυνὸν, et 916. τινάσσων τ' ἐν χεροῖν πυρπνόον βέλος. Non minus nobilis Jovis imago est i. 34. *per purum tonantes Egit equos volucremque currum;* quæ pictori pulcherrimæ picturæ argumentum præbet, quemadmodum jam olim Phidias ex Homericis versibus exemplum effigiei Jovis petiit. Sublimia etiam sunt, quæ dicit Horatius de poetis magni spiritus. Sic et Pindarum iv. 2. *Dircæum cygnum,* et Varium i. 6. *Mæonii carminis alitem* appellat. Possemus, si liceret, plura afferre multisque exemplis docere, quam audacter Græci poetæ poeticum ingenium atque carminum vim exprimant et describant. Sed ad alia properamus i. 3. fingit noster illi, qui primam navim fabricaverit, pectus ferreum et robore circumdatum fuisse. *Illi robur et æs triplex circa pectus erat.* Addam similia loca ex Æschylo meo *Prometh.* 242. Σιδηρόφρων τε κἀκ πέτρας εἰργασμένος, Ὅστις, Προμήθευ, σοῖσιν οὐ ξυνασχαλᾷ Μόχθοις, *Sept. c. Theb.* 52. Σιδηρόφρων γὰρ θυμὸς, ἀνδρεία φλέγων, Ἔπνει, λεόντων ὡς ἄρην δεδορκότων. Statius *Theb.* iii. 200. *scopulos et ahena precando Flectere corda paro,* vide alia exempla apud Broukhusium *ad Tibull.* i. 1. 64. De hac igitur felicis audaciæ parte, quæ magnis sententiis continetur, nihil amplius addam. Nam etsi plura exempla restant, facile tamen ea attenti lectores observabunt.

[*Tertium Audaciæ genus elocutio.*]

Paucis nunc docebimus, quæ sit in elocutione audacia. Nempe si poeta a communi loquendi usu recedit, si verba audacter transfert a communi significatione ad novam, magnis figuris utitur, nova verba fingit, antiqua renovat, inusitatas verborum construendorum rationes adhibet. Si Horatii carmina legas, videbis primum multas audaces figuras; observabis deinde rara aut nova etiam verba; denique Græcæ verborum constructionis multa exempla animadvertes. De singulis his agamus.

[*I. Audaces figuræ.*]

Jam in audacibus figuris recensendis, quibus Horatius carminibus suis magnam laudem conciliavit, moneo, ne quis a nobis figurarum catalogum e Grammaticorum præceptis contextum exspectet. Non curabo, non quæram, utrum figura sit Anaphora an Metaphora, utrum Metonymia an Synecdoche, aut Hyperbole. Hæc nos quidem Grammaticorum filiis relinquamus. Satis sit nobis, verba a vulgari ratione audacter translata commemorasse. Hic vero primum nobis occurrit illa figura, quæ rebus omni sensu destitutis quasi vitam donat, et de qua Quintilianus dicit viii. 6. *præcipue ex his oritur mira sublimitas, quæ audaci et proxime periculum translatione tolluntur, cum rebus sensu carentibus actum quendam et animos damus;* adde, quæ monet Demetrius *de elocutione* 81. Ἀρίστη δὲ δοκεῖ μεταφορὰ, τῷ Ἀριστοτέλει ἡ κατ' ἐνέργειαν καλουμένη, ὅταν τὰ ἄψυχα ἐνεργοῦντα εἰσάγηται καθάπερ ἔμψυχα. Talia apud nostrum poetam occurrunt permulta. Sic mari et fluminibus frequenter sensus tribuitur. Nam i. 14. *imperiosius æquor.* iii. 1. *tumultuosum æquor.* iii. 4. *insaniens Bosporus.* iii. 9. *improbo iracundior Adria. Epod.* 2. *iratum mare* iii. 27. *Æquoris nigri fremitus,* occurrit. Non aliter Græci poetæ, ut Simonides; et sæpe Homerus. Audacius Æschylus in duobus locis: *Prometh.* 725. τραχεῖα πόντου Σαλμυδησσία γνάθος Ἐχθρόξενος ναύτῃσι, μητρυιὰ νεῶν, et *Pers.* 71. πολύγομφον ὄδισμα ζυγὸν ἀμφιβαλὼν αὐχένι πόντου. De fluminibus vero inprimis notanda sunt hæc: iii. 29. *Cum fera diluvies quietos Irritat amnes:* i. 2. de Tiberi: *Iliæ dum se nimium querenti Jactat ultorem—uxorius amnis;* ii. 9. *et rigidum Niphaten Medumque flumen gentibus additum Victis minores volvere vertices.* Fingit poeta, ipsa flumina sentire, suos accolas victos esse, atque se lenius currere debere, et debitum victori cultum et honorem præstare. Similiter Plinius *Paneg.* 82. satis poetice: *Danubius ac Rhenus tantum illud nostri dedecoris vehere gaudebant;* hæc sententia non semel quoque occurrit in duodecim veteribus Panegyricis, de quibus alio tempore dicemus. Eleganter etiam Johannes Secundus p. 239.

> Maxima quem dominum suspirat Roma, Tagoque
> Jam pridem Tiberis liventibus invidet undis;

ubi τὸ *liventibus undis* pulcherrime positum est a poeta. Pariter de Aufido noster iv. 4. *Cum sævit horrendamque cultis Diluviem meditatur agris;* hoc *meditatur* pulcherrimam imaginem habet, et alteri lectioni: *minitatur,* quam Baxterus ex Glossemate ortam fuisse recte dicit, omnino præferendum. Sed plura Horatius fluminibus tribuit, quæ hominum sunt. Sic iii. 13. rivum ob molle, quod edat, murmur, appellat *loquacem,* et iii. 29. ripam, quæ nullis vehementioribus fluctibus alluitur, quæque igitur nullo strepitu resonet, *taciturnam:* (sic etiam Statius *Theb.* iii. 256. *imbelli recubant ubi littora somno,* et 259. *tacent exhausti solibus amnes,* et Propertius iv. 4. 48. *quippe tacentes Fallaci semper limite celat aquas,* vide plura apud Heinsium ad *Claudian. Cons. Mall.* 235. Burmannum ad *Valer. Flacc.* iii. 730. Oudendorpium ad Lucan. i. 260. et x. 328). Quemadmodum iv. 6.

bipenni, *mordaci velut icta ferro Pinus*, ita etiam dentes tribuit fluvio, i. 31. *quæ Liris quieta Mordet aqua.* Immo audacius etiam Æschylus *Prometh.* 367. ἔνθεν ἐκραγήσονταί ποτε Ποταμοὶ πυρὸς δάπτοντες ἀγρίας γνάθοις Τῆς καλλικάρπου Σικελίας λευρὰς γύας. Sic etiam de fluvio dicit, illum *lambere* terras, i. 22. quam formulam pluribus exemplis illustrat Burmannulus ad *Anthologiam T.* i. p. 89. Eodem modo versatur noster in describenda ventorum vi, quos quasi iratos, quasi bella gerentes inducit. i. 9. *ventos æquore fervido* (simile illud Herodoti Ξεσάσης δὲ τῆς θαλάσσης) *depræliantes* i. 25. *Thracio bacchante vento*, et 28. *quodcunque minabitur Eurus Fluctibus Hesperiis*, i. 3. *præcipitem Africum decertantem Aquilonibus*, atque eodem carmine *rabiem Noti, quo non arbiter Adriæ Major tollere seu ponere vult freta:* 1. 1. *luctantem Icariis fluctibus Africum.* Eandem etiam apud Græcos legimus figuram. Æschyl. *Prometh.* 1084. σκιρτᾷ δ' ἀνέμων Πνεύματα πάντων, εἰς ἀλλήλα Στάσιν ἀντίπνουν ἀποδεικνύμενα. Atque hic etiam nobis in mentem venit locus ille, in quo explicando et defendendo multi elaboraverunt, iv. 4.

Dirus per urbes Afer ut Italas,
Ceu flamma per tædas vel Eurus
Per Siculas equitavit undas.

Non ignoro, quid dicant de hoc loco viri docti, verum idem, attentius re considerata, non negari posse arbitror, poetam Euro quoque equitandi notionem tribuisse. Neque me offendit hæc locutio, quanquam illam audacissimam esse, facile largior et fateor. Non repetam locum Euripidis jam ab aliis laudatum, lubet tantummodo exemplis aliquot ostendere, non minus audacter poetas alios de ventis dixisse. Pindarus ventos quasi exercitum proponit: *Pyth.* iv. βαρυγδούπων ἀνέμων στίχες, et vi. χειμέριος ὄμβρος ἐπακτὸς ἐλθὼν ἐριβρόμου νεφέλας στρατὸς ἀμείλιχος: et si Æschylus ea, quæ ventorum et æquoris sunt, militibus tribuere potuit: *Sept. c. Theb.* 63. Φράξαι πόλισμα πρὶν καταιγίσαι πνοὰς Ἄρεος· βοᾷ γὰρ κῦμα χερσαῖον στρατοῦ, atque v. 116. Κῦμα γὰρ περὶ πτόλιν Δοχμολόφων ἀνδρῶν Καχλάζει, πνοαῖς Ἄρεος ὀρόμενον, cur non liceat etiam Horatio, ea, quæ militum sunt, tribuere vento? Si dici potest, Eurum bella gerere et prælium committere cum aliis ventis, pugnare cum fluctibus, furere, quidni etiam dicatur Eurum equitare per undas? Adde, Horatium iii. 3. dicere: *Auster Dux inquieti turbidus Adriæ*, cui ducis notioni bene convenit τὸ *equitare.* Consule etiam Oudendorpium ad *Lucan.* ix. 454. ubi docet, passim fingere poetas, ventos Æolio antro emissos per campos, sicut equos effusos, ruere. Ipse enim ibi Lucanus dicit:

Liberque meatu
Æoliam rabiem totis exercet habenis.

Qui poetas Græcos diligenter legerit, et quam audacter sæpe rem aliquam describant, memmerit, ei hæc locutio non tam insolita videbitur, quam iis, qui nondum his mysteriis initiati sunt. Horatium enim, quanquam idem etiam de reliquis omnibus dici potest, sed in proposito maneamus, Horatium igitur non nisi ab eo bene explicari posse arbitramur, qui, ingenuum et nobilem animum a natura nactus,

judicium legendis Græcis poetis bene subegerit et formaverit, minime vero a famelicis et mercenariis hominibus, qui profanis manibus augusta veteris ævi monimenta attrectantes, Musarum sibi et Apollinis iram conciliant, nullaque alia re freti, quam quod unam alteramve epistolam Ovidii ex Ponto legerint, ad interpretandos poetas accedunt, quos irato suo Genio relinquemus. De ventis etiam memorandus est locus i. 26. ubi iis curas animi deportandas se traditurum esse dicit: *Tristitiam et metus Tradam protervis in mare Ponticum Portare ventis.* Similiter Anacreon, aut incertus potius, Ἐμῶν φρενῶν μὲν αἴραις φέρειν ἔδωκα λύπας, p. 202. Paullo aliter Tibullus, i. 5. 35.

Hæc mihi fingebam, quæ nunc Eurusque Notusque
Jactat odoratos vota per Armenios.

i. 3. alloquitur navim, quasi debitorem suum, cui amicum crediderit, atque ut salvum sibi hoc charum pignus reddat, postulat: *quæ tibi creditum debes Virgilium etc.* cui similis locus est apud Callimachum in *Fragm.* p. 564. Ἄ ναῦς, ἃ τὸ μόνον φέγγος ἐμὶν τὸ γλυκὺ τὰς ζωᾶς Ἀρπάξας, ποτὶ τὲ Ζανὸς ἱκνεῦμαι λιμενοσκόπω. Eodem carmine fulmina dicuntur *iracunda*, quoniam a Jove irato mittuntur, iræque illius ministræ sunt, sicut c. 12. *inimica.* i. 14. de malo, quasi corpore, cui vulnera infligi possint; *malus saucius Africo*, et de stridore antennarum: *Antennæque gemant.* Apud Senecam, qui sæpe Horatium imitatur, *Hipp.* 886. legitur: *ne pressæ gravi spiritu antennæ tremant*, quod mihi bene mutasse videtur Cl. Rhoer in *Feriis Daventr.* p. 45. in *gemant.* Non aliter etiam poeta de mari dicit: ii. 20. *gementis littora Bospori.* Sic etiam Statius *Theb.* iii. 597. *Quantus Tyrrheni gemitus salis;* et Florus iv. 11. licet contra historici leges: *non sine gemitu maris et labore ventorum.* vide Burmannum ad *Ovid. Met.* iv. 449. Æsch. *Prom.* 430. βοᾷ δὲ πόντιος ἑλίνδων ξυμπιτνῶν, στένει βυθός. Et quid de eo dicamus, quod eodem carmine pinum *sylvæ filiam nobilem* appellat: Utitur Pindarus etiam hac filii filiæque notione de pluvia *Ol.* xi. οὐρανίων ὑδάτων ὁμβρίων, παίδων νεφέλας. *Nem.* iv. de carminibus, αἱ δὲ σοφαὶ Μοισᾶν θυγατέρες ἀοιδαὶ, et ix. de vino, ἀργυφέαισι δὲ νωμάτω φιάλαισι βιατὰν ἀμπέλου παῖδα. i. 15. crines Paridis appellat *adulteros*, sive ita dixerit pro crinibus adulteri, sive indicaverit crines ad adulterium allicientes. Pellucidam aquam dicit *vitream*, ut iv. 2. *vitreus pontus*, et iii. 13. *fons splendidior vitro.* Callimach. *hymn. in Cerer.* 29. τὸ δ', ὥστ' ἀλέκτρινον, ὕδωρ Τῷ ἁμαρᾶν ἀνέθυε. Sic Apuleius *Met.* i. *Fluvius ignavus ibat* argento vel vitro *æmulus in colorem.* vid. Heins. ad *Ovid. Epist.* xv. 157. *Est nitidus vitreoque magis perlucidus amni Fons sacer.* Observavimus etiam non semel de arboribus poetam, tanquam de hominibus, loqui. Nam quemadmodum marito orbata mulier vidua dicitur: ita de arboribus frondibus nudatis dicit, eas *viduatas* esse ii. 9. *Et foliis viduantur orni.* Contra dicit *maritare*, quando vites cum populo conjunguntur, *Epod.* 2. *adulta vitium propagine altas maritat populos*, iv. 5. *et vitem viduas ducit ad arbores*, et ii. 15. *platanus cælebs* audit. V. arboribusque dat (sicut. *Stat. Theb.* i. 361. brachia: *rapiunt antiqua procellæ brachia sylvarum) comas*, iv. 7. *redeunt jam gramina campis Arboribusque comæ*, atque iv. 3. *Spissæ nemorum comæ*, ideo etiam

dixit *tondere* arborem, iv. 4. *Duris ut ilex tonsa bipennibus*, vide Burmannum ad *Quintil. Inst. Orat.* viii. 3. p. 680. et plura apud Spanhemium ad *Callim.* p. 65. *etc.* iv. 14. de cladibus utitur verbo, quo de messe alioquin utimur: *Primosque et extremos metendo Stravit humum sine clade victor.* vid. et *Observat. Miscell.* v. 1. *T. I.* p. 29. Sic etiam Æschyl. *Suppl.* 645. ἀρότοις θερίζοντα βρότους ἐν ἄλλοις, de Marte. Latinam formulam docte illustrat Heinsius ad *Ovid. Met.* v. 104. Copiose poeta in Anthol. p. 96.

Namque velut densas prosternens messor aristas
Sole sub ardenti flaventia demetit arva,
Trojugenum infesto prosternit corpora ferro.

i. 37. Cleopatra fortunæ secundæ favore elata dicitur *fortuna dulci ebria:* similiter prope Demosthenes in laudato a Plinio ix. 26. loco: ἐκεῖνον μεθύειν τῷ μεγέθει τῶν πεπραγμένων. i. 72. quercus, secutæ Orphei cantum, appellantur *auritæ*, ubi vetus Schol. notat: *audacter dictum:* i. 10. Apollinem, cui pharetra subducta, appellat *viduum pharetra*, et pharetram plenam telis, *gravidam sagittis*, i. 22. quam formulam aliis exemplis illustrat Heinsius ad *Ovid. Met.* i. 443. et Zinzerlingius in *Promuls. crit. c.* 51. iv. 11. de splendore argenti in ædibus radiantis canit: *Ridet argento domus.* Bachylides p. 256. χρυσῷ δ' ἐλέφαντί τε μαρμαίρουσιν οἶκοι, ut ii. 18. *Non ebur neque aureum Mea renidet in domo lacunar.* Similiter Græcos γελᾶν dicere de splendore ostendit præclare Cl. Wesseling in *dissert. Herodotea* p. 153. vide Hems. ad *Ovid. Met.* xv. 205. et Burmann. ad *Petron.* p. 652. iii. 30. Imbrem, quoniam multa evertit, atque litteras monimentis insculptas extinguit, vocat *edacem* iv. 13. canos ob albidum colorem dicit *capitis nives.* Etsi vero, hanc translationem duram esse, lubenter Quintiliano viii. 17. assentiar, malim tamen in Horatio, lyrico poeta, eam cum Baxtero defendere. Recentiores quidem poetæ non meminisse videntur Quintiliani admonitionem, qui vel in elegiis nives capitis ponunt. Sic Johannes Secundus, p. 62.

Tempora quam longum jucundo florida vere
Stant, neque nix atris crinibus ulla venit.

Dan. Heins. *Sylv.* p. 282. *purpureis tibi Inobsequentes temporibus nives Spargit senectus*, et quis non? Vellem tamen cautius et rarius hac translatione uterentur. i. 25. fluvium Thraciæ frigidissimum appellat *hyemis sodalem*, et iii. 18. craterem, *sodalem Veneris: Larga nec desunt Veneris sodali Vina crateræ.* iii. 1. fundus, qui non respondet votis agricolæ, audit *mendax*, ut iii. 16. *segetis certa fides*[1] *meæ;* de quo nos alio tempore diximus plura, et arborem, quasi accusatam ut infructuosam ab agricola, fingit culpam in aquam et nimium calorem conferre: *Arbore nunc aquas Culpante, nunc torrentia agros Sidera, nunc hyemes iniquas.* Lubet tamen proferre, quod mihi super hujus loci lectione in mentem venerit. Nam et tres versus in sibilantes litteras exire moleste fero, quanquam de his caute pronunciandum esse scio, sed me ignorasse fatear, an pulchre sit dictum *torrentia agros Sidera.* Quid multa? levi mutatione hoc loco legere

[1] See the Preface to Barker's *Cic. de Sen.* p. xii. 2d Ed.—Ed.

mallem *agro:* id est, nunc arbore aquas, nunc agro sidera culpante. Similis locus est apud *Ovid. Met.* v. 483.

> Et modo sol nimius, nimius modo corripit imber,
> Sideraque ventique nocent.

i. 20. tribuit Echo jocum, quasi voces ultimas per jocum reddat: *simul et jocosa Redderet laudes tibi Vaticani Montis imago,* et supra 12. *cujus recinet jocosa Nomen imago.* i. 35. appellat Augustum (quamvis Dacierius aliter sentiat, et hanc interpretationem irrideat) *columnam,* qua fulciatur quasi salus reipublicæ, quæ ne a fortuna proruatur, pulchre orat. *Injuriosa ne pede proruas Stantem columnam:* sic etiam Pindarus. *Ol.* ii. ὃς Ἕκτορ' ἔσφαλε Τροΐας ἄμαχον ἀστραβῆ κίονα, et Lycophron v. 278. Ὦ Δαῖμον, οἷον κίον' ἀϊστώσεις δόμων Ἔρεισμα πάτρας δυστυχοῦς ὑποσπάσας. Alioquin utuntur poetæ verbo *murus,* ut *Ovid. Met.* xiii. 281. *Græcum murus Achilles* et Seneca *in Troad.* 125. *Tu præsidium Phrygibus fessis, tu murus eras.* vide plura apud Burmannum *ad Anthol.* i. p. 84. iii. 24. dum dicit pueros formandos esse ad virtutem, atque ab libidine ad honestam gloriam deducendos; ita canit, quasi elementa pectoribus eradi debeant: *Eradenda cupidinis Pravi sunt elementa, et teneræ nimis mentes asperioribus Formandæ studiis.* Sed videntur mihi hunc locum consideranti attentius pulcherrimi hi versus correctione indigere. Displicet certe τὸ *pravi cupidinis* An una littera deleta et altera reposita melius legatur *Parvis?* nempe pueris eradenda sunt elementa etc. *Parvos* vero dici pueros satis notum. Cicero *de Fin.* v. 15. *Parvi primo ortu sic jacent, tanquam omnino sine animo sint;* plura dat Barthius ad *Stat. Sylv.* p. 152. Sed nolumus plura afferre et copiosius explicare. Quare, omni longiori disputatione omissa, ponamus tantummodo exempla figurarum audacium. Lectores singulas velim secum attentius considerent. i. 1. *fervidæ rotæ.* 3. *impiæ rates.* 5. *aspera nigris æquora ventis.* (Sic Virg. Æn. iii. 285. *Et glacialis hiems aquilonibus asperat undas,* vid. Oudendorp. ad *Lucan.* viii. 198. sed non licet plura proferre, ne moles hujus libelli augeatur) 9. *nec jam sustineant onus Sylvæ laborantes.* 10. (de Mercurio) *curvæque lyræ parentem.* 12. *minax ponto Unda recumbit.* 28. *Aerias tentasse domos, animoque rotundum Percurrisse polum.* 35. *severus uncus.* 36. *lascivæ hederæ.* ii. 6. *viridique certat Bacca Venafro.* 7. *morantem sæpe diem mero fregi.* 9. *inæquales procellæ.* 12. *ducta per vias Regum colla minantium.* 13. *penetralia sparsisse nocturno cruore hospitis.* iii. 4. *vires omne nefas animo moventes.* 6. *Pacori manus non auspicatos contudit impetus.* 9. *vigiles lucernæ.* 12. *patruæ verbera linguæ:* (unde fortasse illustrari potest formula Quinti Fratris Ciceronis non bellissima: *Mirificam mihi verberationem cessationis epistola dedisti).* 14. *decoræ supplice vitta Virginum matres.* 21. *Socraticis madet sermonibus.* 24. *non mortis laqueis expedies caput.* 29. *mundæque camæ sollicitam explicuere frontem.* iv. 2. *vires animumque moresque aureos educit in astra, nigroque invidet orco.* 8. *rejectæ retrorsum Annibalis minæ.* 9. *spirat adhuc amor, vivuntque commissi calores Æoliæ fidibus puellæ: lividæ obliviones.* 13. *tempora quæ semel notis condita fastis,*

Inclusit volucris dies: 14. *agmina ferrata vasto diruit impetu:* Sed cætera ipsis lectoribus quærenda relinquemus. Possis huc etiam referre, quod sæpius poeta res omni sensu carentes alloquitur, ut i. 3. et 14. navim. iii. 13. fontem. i. 32. et iii. 2. lyram: atque iii. 21. amphoram. *O nata mecum consule Manlio quocunque lectum nomine Massicum servas etc.* Quem locum explicare aggressus est Castalio in *Observ. Decad.* v. c. 2. sed, ut mihi videtur, minus recte. Interpretatur enim sic: Quacunque de causa ex eis, vel quas proxime recensui, vel quas non tetigi, quacunque gratia, sive hilaritatis, sive somni causa, vinum conditum asservas etc. Quale acumen! ergone habebant Romani amphoras, quibus condiderant vinum, quo somnum, alias, quibus amorem, alias, quibus rixas concitari volebant? Atque igitur ea de causa, ut hi motus excitarentur, vinum amphoris mandaverant? Immo sensus, si quid video, hic est: O testa, seu amphora, quæ eo anno compacta et fabricata es, qua ego natus, id est, consule Manlio, descende, cujuscunque anni vinum habeas, quocunque consule lectum etc. Rectene tibi hunc locum explicasse videor? lege, quæ alii de hoc loco dicant, et ride. Videtur tamen Dacierius etiam ex aliqua parte verum vidisse.

[*II. Rara vetera et nova verba.*]

Transeamus ad alia. Diximus enim supra ad felicem Horatii in elocutione audaciam referenda esse rara et nova verba. Ad rara etiam vetera verba referimus. Nolumus vero, quantam elegantiam et venustatem poetæ et oratores suis scriptis veterum verborum usu quasi renovato, et novis excogitatis concilient, copiose exponere. Sunt in omnium manibus, certe esse debent, aureæ Quintiliani Institutiones, unde facile peti hæc doctrina poterit. Quare nos quidem commemoratione exemplorum contenti erimus. Ad vetera vero rara et nova verba, quibus Horatius carmina sua, quasi stellis quibusdam, distinxit, referimus. i. 3. *dissociabilis*, pro eo, qui valet dissociare, de quo vide Baxterum et Gesnerum 13. *nota memor*, quæ manet: *catus* et *decoræ more palæstræ:* ii. 1. *motus civicus*, ubi Schol. *civicum sicut hosticum veteres dixerunt:* et iii. 24. *rabiem tollere civicam:* 2. *dedocere:* 7. *quis te redonavit Quiritem*, ubi similiter schol. *attende singulari numero dictum, quod non facile apud veteres invenies*, ubi vide quoque Dacierium. Alias *Quiris* notat quemlibet plebeium vilemque e populo hominem. Vid. Ferrarium *de Re Vestiar. L.* i. c. 6. et Oudendorp. ad *Lucan.* ii. 386. Ibidem nota *redde Jovi dapem*, quod recte etiam Scholiastes notavit: 13. *frangere cervicem*, ubi Schol. *nova verbo exsecratus est parricidam*, ut infra *Epod.* 3. *impia manu senile guttur fregerit:* etsi aliter, et, ut mihi videtur, rectius sentiat Dacierius, nam hæc formula non raro occurrit. vid. Regium et Burmannum ad *Quintil. Inst. Orat.* viii. 3. p. 692. 5. *prægestire*, et 7. *deproperare apio coronas.* vid. Burmann. ad *Ovid. Trist.* iii. 13. 17. iii. 11. *ludit exsultim.* 12. *mala vino lavere*, ubi Schol. *antiqua declinatione dixit lavere.* 17. *denominatus.* 20. *inaudax raptor*, ubi vide Baxterum et Lambinum, qui dicit: *Vox a nemine alio, quod sciam, usurpata.* 23. *Mollibit* pro *molliet* antique. iv. 3. *clarare:* 4. *indecorare:* 6. *noctiluna* pro luna: 16. *tutela Deliæ deæ* passive pro eo, quem

tuetur dea: 9. *obliviones carpere:* 11. *Pegasus terrenum equidem gravatus,* ut Senec. Thyest. v. 106. *jam tuum mœstæ pedem terræ gravantur.* ubi vid. Gronovius et Drackenb. ad *Sil. Ital.* ii. 598. et Oudend. ad *Lucan.* v. 258. 14. *tauriformis Aufidus: belluosus oceanus:* 15. *inimicare,* ubi Schol. *inimicat fictum verbum est,* quod deinde a recentioribus ævi scriptoribus frequentius positum fuit, loca indicat Reinesius ad *Petron.* c. 73. extr. *Epod.* i. *hoc et omne militabitur bellum: Eois intenata fluctibus hiems.* Non lubet tamen de his copiosius agere. Vidimus enim jam plerosque interpretes Horatiana verba, quæ in reliquis scriptoribus aut nunquam, aut rarius occurrunt, notasse. Hos igitur una cum antiquis scholiis consulant, qui plura scire cupiant. Nos vero, qui aliorum scrinia compilare nunquam didicimus, breviter tantummodo hæc indicanda nobis fuisse indicavimus.

[*III. Græcæ constructiones.*]

Quod denique ad Græcam orationis structuram ab Horatio in Latino sermone expressam attinet, plena sunt omnia carmina plurimis exemplis. Quoniam vero Daniel Vechnerus in *Hellenolexia sive Parallelismi Græco-latini libris duobus* copiosissime de hac re egit, atque cum ex Horatio non tantum omnia, tum complura ex aliis scriptoribus exempla contulit atque explicavit, nos quidem lectores ad illum librum ablegabimus. Ne tamen totam intactam relinquamus hanc partem, atque etiam hoc audaciæ genus, quemadmodum priora, exemplis illustremus, e multis adscribamus pauca. i. 3. *audax omnia perpeti:* 7. *plurimus in Junonis honorem.* ii. 12. *lucidum fulgentes oculi,* i. 12. *animæ magnæ prodigus: superare pugnis nobilis:* 15. *furit te reperire atrox:* 12. *blandum ducere quercus:* 27. *immane quantum discrepat:* 29. *doctus sagittas tendere:* 19. *vultus lubricus aspici.* ii. 1. *notus animi paterni:* 3. *flores rosæ:* 4. *penna metuens solvi:* 6. *lassus maris et viarum:* 9. *desine querelarum:* 3. *umbram consociare amant:* 19. *turbidum lætatur.* iii. 4. *Injecta monstris terra dolet suis:* 10. *animum mitior anguibus: me objicere* plorares 16. *fallit sorte beatior:* 27. *perfidum ridens.* iv. 2. *niveus videri:* 4. *acuta belli:* 6. *prosper frugum:* 8. *dives artium:* 11. *vis ederæ. Epod.* 5, 74. *o multa fleturum caput.* Sed tædet plura adscribere. Facile talia inveniri possunt.

Atque hæc quidem nobis de felici Horatii audacia dicta sunto. Utinam vero hac opera faciliorem jucundioremque illius lectionem reddidissemus juventuti! Græca quidem multas ob causas immiscuimus, etsi ea hoc seculo sperni non ignoraremus. Inprimis vero fecimus hoc ideo, quod similibus veterum locis inter se comparatis incredibile est, quantum sensus pulchri et venusti acuatur, animusque noster ad elegantias poetices intelligendas formetur. Digna sunt verba Stephani *in not. ad Anacreont.* c. 12. quæ a me repetantur: *Hæc observatione sunt digna, ut et ipsi discamus caute imitari veteres, et si quid apud illos occurrat, quod in rem nostram sit, ita in usum nostrum illud vertere, ut non aliunde tamen petitum, sed domi natum videatur.*

NOTICE OF

GODOFREDI HERMANNI ELEMENTA DOCTRINÆ METRICÆ. *Lipsiæ*, 1816. 8. *pp.* 813.

WE trust that some of our learned correspondents will, without much delay, favor us with a regular notice of this celebrated work. Of the first edition frequent mention has been made in the *Classical Journal*. In this second edition many important alterations, corrections, and illustrations have been introduced. On the present occasion we shall however content ourselves with laying before our readers the following extracts, which relate chiefly to the critical productions of our own countrymen. What is said about them by so distinguished a foreigner as Professor HERMANN cannot fail to be read with much interest.

"Quum plerique, qui literas antiquas tractant, a philosophicarum disputationum subtilitate alieni sint, plures reperti sunt, qui fidem dictis meis haberent, quam qui rationes eorum intelligerent, qui perpauci fuere: plerique rem in medio positam reliquerunt: quidam, mea partim, partim sua culpa, multa male interpretati, etiam contradixere. Omnium studia commota sunt, ut, si nihil aliud effecerim, certe me non pœniteat, neglectioni rem metricam eripuisse. Postea apud Britannos metra attigit R. PORSONUS, vir magnæ accuratæque doctrinæ, qui, quantum diligenti exemplorum comparatione effici poterat, in iis, quæ nota habebat, metris ita præstitit, ut et observationes quasdam egregias, et non paucas præclaras emendationes attulerit. Omninoque dici vix potest, quantum hic vir exemplo suo studiis Græcarum literarum profuerit. Idem si etiam aliquid obfuit, non sibi ipsi, sed aliis tribuendum est. Magnorum enim virorum est, reserare claustra, et monstrare viam, non quo pone quis sequatur, magna impari passu vestigia legens, aut ad summum ibidem, ubi ipsi, consistat, sed ut longius alii procedant. Porsonus quidem, vir errandi tam parcus, quam Bentleius prodigus fuerat: audentissimus enim ille, quod periculum non formidaret, sæpe, sed κεῖτο μέγας μεγαλωστί: Porsonus igitur, sive non habens parem, seu ratus ita, quum id non celaret, hoc est a popularibus suis consequutus, ut, fassi, dissentire ab eo nefas ducant; non æquum neque e re sua facientes, quum exteros quoque idem servitium subire volunt, siquidem eorum demum justa est atque honesta admiratio, qui mortalem nullum erroris immunem esse memores, ut libere dissentiunt ab aliis, ita ipsi modestiores sunt. Post Porsonum plerique Britannorum

nihil ultra audentes, ad grammaticos relapsi sunt. Dignus est tamen, qui multa cum laude commemoretur GAISFORDIUS, vir doctissimus, qui etsi raro suum interposuit judicium, tamen et probe se didicisse has res, et libere posse ac sine cupiditate judicare ostendit. Hæc præclara editio Hephæstionis nuper demum, jam parte aliqua libri, quem nunc accipis, Blümnere, ad me perlata est. Apud nostrates, quorum hæc singularis virtus est, quod colligendo non contenti, etiam in caussas rerum inquirere amant, AUG. SEIDLERUS versibus dochmiacis, re difficillima, explicandis plus, quam quisquam alius ad metrorum scientiam contulit. Qui etsi eo in libro videtur aliquanto, quam debebat, audacior fuisse, tamen intelligentes harum rerum judices non solum, quam difficile sit, sciunt modum, ubi nova proferas, tenere, sed illud etiam cogitant, præstare utilibus admiscuisse aliquid falsi, quam vacua errore, sed inutilia attulisse. Verumtamen quum ille Porsoni quosdam errores notavisset, contumeliis ab Hujus secta et conviciis, extremo inermium perfugio, exceptus est: qualia quis non æquo animo ferat, quando neque a quovis, neque quavis conditione laudari jucundum est." p. xv—xvii.

"In versibus stropharum disponendis hæc duo maxime vitanda sunt, unum, ne quis temere sensum suum sequatur, præsertim non multa diligentique metrorum pervestigatione exercitatum atque excultum; deinde, ne regulas audiat, idoneo fundamento destitutas, quales ex parum accuratis observationibus, vel ex erroribus veterum, vel ex opinionibus clarorum hominum promanant. Et hoc quidem, quod postremum commemoravi, illorum potissimum causa dixi, qui Porsono auctore, viro doctissimo, sed rei metricæ non ultra notissima metra perito, nihil prius sibi agendum putant, quam ut versus, si fieri possit, omnes ad eamdem metri formam redigant: quod quam perversum sit, et supra p. 493. [ubi sunt hæc:—"Secundum genus Anacreonteorum bis invenitur in Prometheo, v. 128. —v. 397. Burneius et Blomfieldius, Porsoni regulam, quamplurimos versus in idem metrum reddi jubentis, sequuti, utroque in loco dimetros choriambicos constituerunt, non sine dispendio venustatis numerorum, et contra disertam auctoritatem veterum,"] et olim in præfatione ad Hecubam p. 70. indicavi. Nam etsi bona est Porsoni admonitio, curandum esse, ut eadem metri species quam sæpissime recurrat, tamen neque ipse Porsonus satis caute ea usus est, et imitatores ejus, ut solent, qui toti ex alieno ore pendent, multo gravius in hoc genere peccarunt." Pag. 701.

"Porsonum sequutus censor Editionis mcæ Supplicum Euripidis in Diario Classico (*Classical Journal*) T. viii. p. 428. seqq. dum in res fortuitas parumque momenti intentus erat, regulam proposuit hanc, ubi tertius pes tragici senarii una voce continerctur, simulque versus dividi posset in duas partes æquales, plerumque alteram versus partem aut elisionem ante se habere, aut voca-

bulo incipere, quod orationem inchoare non posset, veluti ἂν, γὰρ, δὲ, μὲν, omninoque dictionibus encliticis; eamque regulam non solum ad eos versus spectare, in quibus tertius pes vel integro vocabulo, vel parte longioris vocabuli impleretur, sed etiam in quibus illud vocabulum ex duobus in unum conjungi solitis constaret, qualia sunt δήπου, εἴπερ, εἴτις, καίπερ, μέντοι, ὅστις, ὅταν, οὕτις, οὕτοι, τοίγαρ, τοίνυν, ὥσπερ. Non facile, inquit, intelligi, cur magis placuerit auribus Atheniensium,

εἰς τάσδε γὰρ βλέψασ' | ἐπηυξάμην τάδε,
κείνη γὰρ ὤλεσέν | νιν, εἰς Τροίαν τ' ἄγει,

quam,

εἰς τάσδε γὰρ βλέψας | ἐπηυξάμην τάδε,
κείνη γὰρ ὤλεσεν | τάδ', εἰς Τροίαν τ' ἄγει,

at facto tamen rem comprobari. Nempe tota ista observatio talis est, ut, qui sic omnes tragicorum versus per singulos pedes examinare velit, multa possit hujusmodi, quæ casu facta sunt, pro regulis vendere. Quid est enim, quod, ut ipse fatetur vir doctus, qui hanc observationem in medium attulit, Æschylus ac Sophocles sæpe violaverunt legem istam, Euripides autem, multo illis alias negligentior, eam observavit? Num illi duo, qui principes in hoc genere poëseos habiti sunt, non eadem in urbe fabulas suas, et coram iisdem Atheniensibus exhibuerunt? Quanto satius erat, ad illud animi attentionem convertere, quod Græcos, si saperent, facere oportebat, quodque fecisse eos, diligentem lectorem latere non potest, ut pro sententiæ atque orationis multiplici conformatione, proque ea ratione, quam recitatio dictis conveniens sequi deberet, alio atque alio modo versus componerent, nihil nisi sensum sequuti suum: quem nos si indagare volumus, non eum profecto ex literis et syllabis colligere poterimus, sed potius, ex fonte suo, orationis sententiæque natura, haustus, deinde in his minutiis ultro se nobis offeret." Pag. 118.

"ELMSLEIUS, quum in censura Editionis meæ Herculis Euripidei ad v. 469. Atticos vocem δαίδαλος usurpasse negaret, non meminerat Æschyli in Eum. 638. Omninoque in poëticis vocabulis major concessa est licentia, quam quæ usu certæ dialecti circumscribi possit." Pag. 569.

"Apud Heraclidem Ponticum Alleg. Hom. p. 13. ed. Schow.

Τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἔνθεν κῦμα κυλίνδεται,
τὸ δ' ἔνθεν· ἄμμες δ' ἂν τὸ μέσσον
ναῦ φορήμεθα σὺν μελαίνᾳ,
χειμῶνι μοχθεῦντες μεγάλῳ κάλων.
πὲρ μὲν γὰρ ἄντλος ἱστοπέδαν ἔχει,
λαῖφος δὲ πᾶν ζάδηλον ἤδη,
καὶ λακίδες μεγάλαι κατ' αὐτό.
χαλᾶσι δ' ἀγκυραι.

Κάλων reposuit Blomfieldius, dissimulans, ut videtur, ducem sibi fuisse Schowium. *Περ* dedi pro *παρά*. Sic Alcæus ap. Apollonium Dysc. de Pronomine p. 395. A. ut vidit Bast. ad Gregor. Cor. p. 616.

οἵκῳ τε πὲρ σῷ καὶ περ' ἀτιμίαις.

Apud eumdem Heraclidem ibidem:

τόδ' αὖτε κῦμα τῷ προτέρῳ νέον
ὁμοστιχεῖ . . παρέξει δ'
ἄμμι πόνων πολὺν . . ἀντλῆν.

Hoc fragmentum parum feliciter tentavit P. Elmsleius in *Diario Classico* No. XVI. p. 395." Pag. 688.

" Ac singulos cantores interdum loqui vel canere quum aliquot abhinc annis amicos quosdam monuissem, exemplo usus, quod supra commemoravi in fine cap. 20. jam pervulgatum esse video. Monitumque est ea de re, sed paucis in locis, a veteribus scholiastis, ut ad Æschyli S. c. T. et Eum. Exempla dedi in meis Herculis Furentis et Supplicum Euripidis Editionibus: de quibus si non persuasi quibusdam, non id mirandum puto: nam qui nihil præter verba et canones grammaticos in antiquis scriptoribus venantur, hi, quod ultra est, oderunt curare." Pag. 755.

" Quod in Britannorum *Diario Classico*, si bene memini, ab nescio quo proditum legi, binos semper æquales versus in epodis esse a tragicis conjunctos, id ejusmodi est, ut miner in mentem cuiquam venire potuisse." Pag. 731.

" Blomfieldium, qui in Museo Cantabrigiensi denuo edidit Sapphus Fragmenta, mallem in his, quæ impedita sunt, quam in dialecto, re nimium lubrica, et periculi, quam meriti pleniore, operam suam posuisse, saltem, ut ne varietatem lectionis, maximum et in fragmentis sæpe unicum præsidium, omitteret." Pag. 605.

" Aliud periodici carminis exemplum diu latuit in Æschyli Prometheo v. 568. seqq. V. 576. a verbis, *ὑπὸ δὲ κηρόπλαστος ὀτοβεῖ δύναξ*, stropham incipere, cujus antistropham interpositis quatuor trimetris sequi v. 595.—609. in commentario ad Aristotelis librum de Arte Poetica p. 148. indicavi. Postea etiam Elmsleius ea de re monuit, ac Monkius in *Museo Critico* T. i. P. v. p. 58. seqq. dispositum dedit hoc carmen, plerisque versibus eodem modo correctis, ut a me quoque emendati fuerant: sed in aliis neque dispositionem ejus, neque correctiones veras puto." Pag. 768.

" In Leonidæ Tarentini Epigr. 25. in Anal. Brunck. Salmasius *εὐκαπὲς* scribendum putabat, probante Dorvillio, pro *εὐκαμπὲς*, in quo, ut in Æschyli *ἀμπύκων* Suppl. 438. qui locus tamen huc non pertinet, Seidlerus de Verss. Dochm. p. 25. ingeniosam iniit viam, quæ correptionem non destitutam esse defensione ostenderet." Pag. 47. " Blomfieldius ad Callimachi H. Dian. 10.: 'In Leo-

nidæ Tar. Epigr. Br. Anal. T. i. p. 226. versus hujusmodi legitur, *Εὐκαμπὲς ἄγκιστρον καὶ δούνακα δουλιχόεντα.* Vocalem ante μπ corripi posse contendit Jacobsius post Toup. et Musgravium, quibus, qui vult, fidem habeat. Versum Leonidæ difficilem emendatu vocat Seidlerus de Vers. Dochm. p. 25. n. Itane vero? Utinam nihil inter poetarum Græcorum reliquias difficilius sanatu esset. Quid enim? unumne tantum hamum, quem consecraret, possidebat *ὁ γριπεὺς Διόφαντος*? Non hoc isti putabunt, qui mecum rei piscatoriæ operam navarint. Lege, *Ἄγκιστρ' εὐκαμπῆ καὶ δ. δ.*' Et mox, quum quinque exempla, in quibus pluralis est, attulisset, ita pergit: 'Ceterum Seidlerus iste, qui tam facilem correctionem prætervidit, de Porsoni, si Diis placet, erroribus, a se castigatis, magnifice loquitur. Nempe leoni mortuo vel asinus calcibus frontem exterit.' Qui sciunt, quæ leges sint artis criticæ, etiam laudabunt Seidlerum, quod se prætervidenda hac correctione criticum, quam facienda piscatorem præbere voluerit. Rationes afferre in re plana supervacaneum puto. Sed ii, quibus exempla pro ratione sunt, viderint, quid faciant Archiæ Epigrammate X. Illum vero ego non ineptum dixerim, qui ex isto Epigrammate Archiæ apud Leonidam scribendum conjiciat, *Γαμψόν τ' ἄγκιστρον.* Ceterum aliquanto verecundius, loquuturum spero virum optimum, ubi reputaverit, quo quisque doctior sit, i. e. quo magis didicerit, quantum sit, quod nesciat, eo solere modestiorem esse. Profuerit autem inspexisse censuram *Æschyli Persarum* in *Diariis Jenensibus* m. Junio h. a. fol. 105. 106. a tali viro scriptam, cui non facile quis superbius respondeat." Pag. 809.

CAMBRIDGE TRIPOS FOR 1789.

Sic res quæque suo ritu procedit, et omnes
Fœdere Naturæ certo discrimina servant.—*Lucret.*

Unde habitum, et varium variis inolescere formis
Ingenium Natura dedit, quascunque capaci
Continet amplexu tellus; unde ordine certo
Singula quæque suas dotes sortita, locumque,
Continuam irruptâ seriem servare catenâ;
Hinc canere aggredior. Facilis, succurre canenti,
Natura, et, tremulis tua dum vestigia plantis
Prosequor, ut tanto possim superesse labori,
Adde novas vires: quem tu non videris æquo
Lumine, nocturnis amat impallescere chartis
Nequicquam, et frustra exercet se carmine vates.
Principio in campis vento pluviisque coactas

Particulas sensim aspicias coalescere, et ingens
Formari glebæ pondus, quam nulla facultas
Intus agit vitæ, nec sese attollere terra
Pigra valet; tantum immissis alimenta ministrat
Seminibus, Cereri unde venit vigor, arvaque rident
Frugibus, et lætas diffundit copia messes.
Quinetiam arboreos fœtus quoscunque Dianæ
Custodi nemorum, quoscunque aut roscida flores
Terra tulit fundens lætum tibi, Chloris, odorem,
Insita vis illis quanquam et subtilior omnes
Pervadat fibras virtus, animetque virentes,
Nec mutare locum, aut possunt discedere ab umbra
Materna; duris arcte radicibus arbor
Capta manet, ramosque leves extendit in auras.
At quæ silvestres saltus ac lustra peragrant
Sæcula, quæ liquido sublimes aere cursus
Festinant, et quæ volvuntur monstra per undas;
Illis larga dedit passim Natura vagari,
Ut sua quemque trahunt studia, et sentire dolores
Corporis, et blandæ vitai exquirere sensim
Gaudia. Nonne vides? pullis implumibus ales
Semper ut assideat tristique ciconia cura
Nutriat; ut pulli, vires cum firmior ætas
Suppeditat, senioque parens languescit inerti,
(Dulce ministerium!) inventas per rura lacertas
Sponte sua prædas ad limina nota reportent;
Scilicet ut matri memores pia munera reddant.
Ætheream interea proprio sub pectore flammam
Sentit homo, et rectam format, ratione magistra,
Ad normam mores: hinc justa lege coercet
Affectus animi nimios, hinc læta virorum
Progenies sociæ exercet commercia linguæ.
Nec tamen, hæc cum sit tanto discrimine nota
Gens hominum, nullis pariles animalibus adsunt
Ingenii dotes. Rerum namque alma creatrix
Effundit tenuem mortali in pectore lucem
Interdum, et brutis mentem silvestribus addit
Indole silvestri majorem; ita compede nectit
Diversas gentes, justoque ita vita tenore
Omnigenam induitur formam, qua prima latescit
In lapide, et qua per varios inventa meatus
Tandem hominum in membris summo splendescit honore.
Quippe silex glebam, tantum quod crescit, inertem
Exsuperat, vitæque jacet confinia propter;
Tarda tamen crescit, propriique haud conscia motus.

At quibus extollam numeris, quo carmine dicam
Dilectum[1] Veneri florem? cui mater Amoris,
(Ut fama est,) voluit fibris concrescere sensus
Paulatim, et foliis dulces insidere succos.
Insidias utinam tales levis undique turba
Muscarum fugiat, latices neque libet amænos,
Aut prope pellaces oras misera explicet alas,
Quippe intus tribus armavit Dea candida telis
Melliferam frondem; quæ, postquam ore improba musca
Attingit, subito in gyrum se contrahit, arcto
Comprimit amplexu captivam, et spicula figit.
Hoc facit exiguos magnum munimen in hostes
Scilicet, aut muscæ tenui se sanguine pascit.
Hæc tamen, hæc culti quamvis supereminet horti
Flores, ingenium parvis vix piscibus offert
Æquandum, quibus angusto sub limine conchæ
Sufficit exiles vitæ scintillula sensus.
Nam saxo affixi, quoties ad littora fluctus
Æquor agit refluos, undam sorbere marinam
Ore solent patulo, dubiumque hinc quærere victum.
Si vero quisquam scopulis avellere concham
Incautus properet, tum sensim deserit humor
Omnis, et occumbit subitæ brevis incola morti.
Huic minima est virtus, quorum Natura calore
Artus sensifero vestit: si forte requiras,
Quænam hominem pecudesque inter sit copula nexa,
Contemplator, ubi natos videt India lucis
Sternere humi membra; horrendas ibi Simia silvas
Occupat, incessum faciemque simillima genti
Humanæ: et si non hirsuto tegmine corpus
Huic esset generi, socios agnosceret ultro
Deceptus specie procul aspectuque viator.
Has inter silvas hominum gens barbara sedes
Obtinet antiquas, inculta, et tristia regna,
Cui forma, et voce, et cultu vix Simia cedat.
Talis adest vita, et tam fœdis moribus ævum
Consumunt illi, queis parce dona ministrat,
Obscuramque facem ratio; at mens improba cultu
Exuerit silvestrem animum, curaque secunda
Suscipiet, quoscunque velit, non tarda labores.
Hinc aliis alii præstant; pars maxima fausto
Omine vitaï coluit felicior artes;
Ast aliis pandit fontem doctrina severum,

[1] Muscipula Dionæa.

Difficiles cursus sophiæ; pars altera servit
Eloquio, aut facili vacat indulgere Camœnæ.
Sic sibi quisque locum servat, sua debita cuique
Palma datur, varium dum gaudet Musa tueri
Ingenium, dum scandit iter sublime volatu
Aerio, summoque sedentem in culmine vidit
Neutonum ———————
Hunc ultra nunquam fas est se extendere menti
Humanæ, aut cœli obscuros reserare recessus.
Fortunata domus![1] quam tanti scripsit alumnus
Nominis hæredem, matremque agnovit amicam;
Dudum animi vigeas cultrix, et vincere tantum
Quamvis humanis non detur viribus, adsint,
Qui servent, memorique viri vestigia gressu
Observata legant; nec dedignare canentem
Me, licet ingenium rude sit, tenuisque Minervæ,
Atque rudi audacem leges depingere versu
Naturæ, sertisque tuis subnectere laurum.

V. P. LITTLEHALES,
Trin. Coll.

In Comitiis Posterioribus,
Mar. 26, 1789.

LATIN POEM.

Vexat Mathematicos demonstrationum inanis gloriola. His omnibus, quæ nihil profutura sunt, merito contemtis et amputatis, admirationi erit quot annos integros lucrabimur.—*Milton.*

——— Nisi quod pede certo
Differt sermoni, sermo merus.—*Horat.*

Anne ideo ut placeant, rectoque poemata talo
Stent, et honos adsit, verborum tanta cadet vis,
Ut totidem pelves et tintinnabula dicas
Pulsari? In corvos scribendi abeat genus illud,
Et merito. Quid enim? Diverso more modoque
Bullatas Bavius nugas, et Mævius iste,
Stridenti stipula disperdidit? Hac ratione,
Judice me, implevit ruptas latratibus auras,
Qui, merus interpres verborum, vatis Homeri
Carmina ad extremum pessumdedit unus et idem,

[1] Trin. Coll.

Et crudum cecinit Priamum Priamique pisinnos.[1]
Ut facies hominum diversæ, sic quoque mens est
Discolor. Hic elegos, biferique rosaria Pæsti,
Et molles violas, et suave rubentem hyacinthum
Cantans, flumina amat silvasque inglorius. Est cui
Ingenium Natura dedit ferventius amne
Montano, ut mores hominum consideret, et quæ
Intus sueta geri in scenam depromat apertam,
Impavidus: neque enim curat, si rodere quisquam
Audeat, atque oculis obliquis limet, eo quod
Candidus impertit quæ sentiat, et vice grata
Insimulat laudatque.—Sibi æque ac Sardanapalo
Ver natum novit, tempestatesque serenas,
Nullius addictus jurare in commoda; quamvis
Non gemma bibat, aut Sarrano dormiat ostro.
Sed neque convenient gaudentes rure Camœnæ,
Nec molles elegi, Satiræve severior usus,
Auribus horum hominum: quanquam Miltonus, et ipse
Johnsonus possent tali indulgere labori;
Et qui, divite vena, animum censoris honesti
Sumsit, et in chartis vitium perstrinxit acutis,
Simplicitate potens, puroque simillimus amni.[2]
" Sunt etenim ista nihil, nihil hæc sunt nomina;" dicunt
Ore *Mathematici* patulo; " problemata Vinci
" Qui sapit, hic tantum est dignus qui vivat, et astra
" Vertice sublimi feriat: Vescantur oportet
" Omne genus vatum siliquis ac pane secundo."—
Scilicet hoc mirum, et fixis obtutibus adstes,
Ni noris dixisse ex his quendam haud ita pridem,
Miltonum cecinisse *satis bene* de *Paradiso*
Amisso,—sed nil toto ostendisse libello,
Aut ubi sit locus iste, aut quo sint vivere pacto
Sueti Eva atque Adamus sine cerdone et sine mensis!!
" Atque hoc pro certo?" Verum est; et pignore quovis
Contendam dixisse; neque est mirabile; namque
Plura etiam audivi simili composta metallo,
Et pejora istis, possunt si talia fingi.
At quorsum hæc πολυπραγμοσύνη? quorsumve tabellas
Perlustrant, Neutone, tuas? Volvuntur, ut ante,
Sidera, cærulei cœli per concava; et ipsa

[1] " Labeo transtulit Iliada et Odysseam verbum ex verbo, ridicule satis, quod verba potius quam sensum secutus sit. Ejus est ille versus; *Crudum manduces Priamum Priamique pisinnos.*" Vet. Gloss. in Pers. Sat. i. 4. Vide Iliad. Δ. 35.

[2] Addisonus.

Nocturnos currus, ceu quondam, agit aurea Phœbe;
Sed nec adhuc certum est, an sint hæc sidera nostro
Orbi terrarum paria;[1] an sit pallida Luna
Caseus, aut creta potius fabricata rotunda.
Quinimmo, ut perhibent, studio hoc opus est, ut in omne
Inspicias, tanquam in speculum, concinnius; ut vi
Majore incumbas operi;— seu te mage rostri
Cepit amor, strepitusve fori et facundia; sive
Dura tibi peragenda rei sit causa Petilli.
Scilicet ut scelerum puros patriæque et amicis
Restituas, quos dira mali spes muneris, et quos
Furciferi, innocuos quamvis, perjuria reddunt
Suspectos. Sed enim mendax infamia terret
Quem nisi mendacem et mendosum?—Ut ego redeam ad rem,
Omnia fiant hæc sine prismate. Sint modo sensus
Communis, mentis vigor, et sibi conscia virtus,
Eloquiumque sagax venturi actique,—quid ultra
Expectes? "Nihilum." Cadit ergo quæstio? "Sic est."

J. B. Trin. Coll. Cant.
III. *non. April.* MDCCCXIII.

REMARKS ON

The Similarity of Worship, that prevailed in different parts of the Pagan World.

: אנשים אחים——Gen. xiii. 8.

PART III.—[*Continued from No. XXVIII. p. 355.*]

IN every branch of this widely spreading idolatry, we may discover, that trees were holden in the greatest veneration, and were almost inseparable from the religious systems of the earliest Polytheists. Of this sort was the Grove-worship recorded in Scripture; and from an accurate comparison of the sacred accounts of Baál-Péor, Moloch, Chemosh, and other idols with the narrative of Herodotus, we obtain the clearest insight into the different allu-

[1] Hoc est, *similia;* ut Virgilianum illud, "*Par* levibus ventis, volucrique *simillima* somno."

sions to it, which occur in the prophetic pages.' All these clearly originated from perverted traditions of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, recorded in the book of Genesis; for in every heathen system of religious worship we may discern trees of knowledge, and in every paradise trees of life: and it is possible, that even in the earlier ages, trees were respected by the worshippers of the true God. We read in the 21st chapter of Genesis, that Abraham planted a grove in Beer-Sheba for a religious purpose —

(ויטע אשל בבאר שבע ויקרא שם בשם יהוה אל עולם:

Although, in process of time, his descendants erected groves in honor of the idols of the neighbouring nations; accordingly, in Deuteronomy they are prohibited from making a grove of trees near the altar of Jehovah, and in the 2nd book of Kings, their transgression of this prohibition is stated as one cause of the captivity of the ten tribes. Hence we easily see how sacred groves and enclosures obtained among Indians, Persians, Runes, Celts, and almost every known class of idolaters: and none seem to have more devoted themselves to this superstition than the Druids. As the grove was the spot which they in general selected for the performance of their religious rites, so the Ascetics in India perform austerities in the forest under the Banian tree; thus we read in the Ramayana, that Rama, Lakshmana, and Sita, went to the forest for fourteen years at the instigation of one of the wives of their father, Dasuratha. Tacitus (Germ.) observes of the Semnones: "Fides antiquitatis religione firmatur. Stato tempore, *in sylvam auguriis patrum et* PRISCA *formidine sacram*, omnes ejusdem sanguinis populi legationibus coeunt, cæsoque publicè homine, celebrant barbari ritûs horrenda primordia. Est et alia LUCO reverentia. Nemo, nisi vinculo ligatus ingreditur, ut minor, et potestatem numinis præ se ferens," &c. &c. Dionysius Halicarnassensis mentions, that the Arcadians also worshipped the Deity in a grove; and Mela, speaking of Egypt, records, "in quodam lacu Chemmis insula *lucos sylvasque et* APOLLINIS GRANDE SUSTINENS TEMPLUM natat." St. Pierre, according to Shoberlt's translation, has the following luminous remarks: "the very sounds of plants are not to be overlooked; for when agitated by the wind, most of them emit sounds peculiar to themselves, and which produce highly agreeable harmonies or contrasts with the situations in which they are accustomed to grow. In India, the hollow canes of the bamboo, which shade the banks of the rivers, imitate as

---

' Isaiah. i. 30.: כי יבשו מאילים אשר חמדתם
הנחמים באלילים תחת כל־עץ־רענן שחטי הילדים בנחלים תחת
סעפי הסלעים: Isaiah.

they rustle against each other the sound of the working of a ship: and the pods of the Cinnamon agitated by the winds on the summit of a mountain, the clack of a mill. The moveable leaves of the poplar convey to the ear in the midst of the forest the babbling of brooks. The verdant meads, and the calm forests, fanned by the Zephyrs, represent in the depths of the vallies, and on the sides of the hills, the undulations and the murmurs of the waves of the sea, breaking against the shore. The early inhabitants of the globe struck with these mysterious sounds, imagined that they heard oracles from the trunks of the oaks, and that the Nymphs and Dryads, enclosed in their rugged bark, inhabited the mountains of Dodona." Mr. Maurice has remarked, that the Brahmănas "delight in the deep shade of trees of gigantic growth;" and Lord Valentia (vol. II. pp. 118, 119.), gives a curious account of the devotion still paid in India to certain trees, that are esteemed sacred. The East has ever been fond of them:——in one of the Indian islands the واقواق is said to grow to the height of a hundred cubits, bearing sea-green leaves, resembling shields, and fruit like a man's head, having in it ears, eyes, and nose. When the wind is boisterous, this marvellous tree is said to bend its branches, and to utter the sound of واق واق from whence its name is derived, and the island in which it is to be seen is likewise called واقوق. In this is a mountain, which yields so much gold, that the natives use no other metal for the most menial purposes, and monkeys and apes are instructed to sweep the houses, and perform the offices of servants. The Arabic writers make mention of it under the name of واق. The Sanskrit authors, however, reflect more light on it, from whom it appears, that this واقوق island is Sumatra, called by them Nari-kela, because it abounds in cocoa-nut trees, the fruit of which is "*like a man's head, having ears, eyes, and nose;*" and when the wind causes the leaves to strike against each other, the sound of bòc-bòc (unde واقوق) is produced. Herodotus (Clio 203.) mentions another extraordinary production of nature: ἔθνεα δὲ ἀνθρώπων πολλὰ καὶ παντοῖα ἐν ἐωυτῷ ἔχει ὁ Καύκασος· τὰ πολλὰ πάντα ἀπ' ὕλης ἀγρίης ζώοντα· ἐν τοῖσι καὶ δένδρεα φύλλα τοιῆσδε ἰδέης παρεχόμενα εἶναι λέγεται, τὰ τρίβοντας καὶ παραμίσγοντας ὕδωρ ζῶα ἐωϋτοῖσι ἐς τῆς ἐσθῆτα ἐγγράφειν· τὰ δὲ ζῶα οὐκ ἐκπλύνεσθαι ἀλλὰ συγκαταγηράσκειν τῷ ἄλλῳ εἰρίῳ, κατάπερ ἐνυφανθέντα ἀρχήν· μίξιντε τούτων τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἶναι ἐμφάνεα, κάταπερ τοῖσι προβάτοισι. Dr. F. Buchanan, in his Essay on the Religion and Literature of the Burmas, observes, that "each of the four great islands has its peculiar sacred tree, which being produced at the beginning of the world of its own accord, and by the power of Fate, will continue as long as the world itself." He says, that in the northern island

grows the famous tree Padezabayn, on which precious garments of every kind hang instead of fruit; that it produces excellent rice without any husk; that whilst the natives are eating the rice, the most exquisite meats appear on the leaves and branches of the tree, according to each person's particular desire, which food will expel hunger for seven days, and that, when the repast is finished, the remains spontaneously disappear. Twenty juzana north-east of the great city MAHA-SUDASSANA, is another sacred tree, which is surrounded by some like the Padeza-bayn, and others, which produce fruit and flowers. When the tree blossoms, its "ruddy splendour extends all round to the distance of fifty juzana, and its most agreeable odour is diffused twice that length." The Bauddhists, like the Muhhammedans, imagine an infernal tree, which is beset with thorns, and named Lœppan, which the damned are compelled to ascend and descend: and the fruit of الزقوم is the heads of Devils. Mr. Moore mentions, that he saw in India the sketch of a tree yielding men, with the word Bhima subscribed: Bhima, however, in Brahmmical mythology is a personage of some importance, and in the Mahā-bhārāta is said to represent Justice: hence Amera Sinha ranks it among the names of Siva, and as the word Bhima implies wrath, it may have some corresponding relationship with الزقوم.—It was under the shade of the sacred tree Guaung-bayn, (Ficus Indica,) which is also surrounded by many smaller trees, that Godama received his divine nature; and in the paradise of Indra, God of the firmament, there are five, some of which possess the before-mentioned properties. In the paradise of Muhhammed, likewise, is Tubee, the never-failing tree; whilst Sudreh, or the Lotè-tree, is the residence of Gabriel, and was the ornament of Eden, according to these lines of the inimitable Hhafezz:

منت سدره و طوبي زپي سايه مكش
كه چو خوش بنكرب اب سرو روان اينهمت نيست

But their Ulamā are by no means agreed, whether or not Paradise, the residence of the faithful, be already created: the Motazalites argue, that it will differ from that, whence our first parents were expelled; the Manichæans place it in the Sun, and others conceive, that after the resurrection, the earth will be melted down, and reproduced, as from a furnace, in a paradisiacal state. The Druids make mention of Pren-puraar, the tree of pure gold, and the Edda in glowing verse describes the Ash Ygg-drasil.

Priar rötr standa
A Pria vega
Undan Asci Ygg-drasils. &c. &c.

Intimately connected with this subject are the Druidical temples, which must, however, be cursorily discussed, as no writer on the Druids has left them unessayed. That their circular forms bore mystic allusions to Astronomy, is too evident to be doubted, and that they are in direct correspondence with Indian opinions on this head, has been ably displayed by General Vallancey. It is likely, that the Patriarchs had such rude and open sanctuaries, although, perchance, differing in form; and the circular courts that surrounded the tabernacle and temple, seem to bear marks of resemblance. Meyrick supposes, that the knowledge of astronomy was brought from Asia by the Bards, and carried to India by the Brahmănas.—Captain Wilford informs us, that the Brahmănas and Jainas invariably give a circular form to the worldly temple of the Deity; and Lord Valentia states, that there are two singular round towers N. W. of Bhaugulpore, like the buildings in Ireland, (which have so much puzzled antiquaries,) excepting that they are more ornamented. The Raja of Jayanagur considers them holy, and has erected a small building to shelter the vast number of his subjects, who annually come to worship them. All these people conceived it impious to confine the Deity within the walls, wherefore they erected open temples in his honour—

כִּי הֲאֻמְנָם יֵשֵׁב אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם עַל־הָאָרֶץ
הִנֵּה שָׁמַיִם וּשְׁמֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם לֹא יְכַלְכְּלוּךָ
אַף כִּי־הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר בָּנִיתִי׃

Cicero de legibus, l. III., observes: "Deorum delubra esse in urbibus censeo, nec sequor magos Persarum, quibus auctoribus, Xerxes inflammâsse templa Græciæ dicitur, quòd parietibus includerent Deos, quibus omnia deberent esse patentia et libera, quorumque hic mundus omnis templum esset et domus." — Dio. lib. 36, speaking of Solomon's temple, says, that ἀχανής τε καὶ ἀνώροφος ἦν—and Tacitus Germ. remarks, "Ceterùm nec cohibere parietibus Deos, neque in ullam humani oris speciem adsimulare, ex magnitudine cœlestium arbitrantur: lucos ac nemora consecrant, Deorumque nominibus appellant SECRETUM illud, quod solâ reverentiâ vident." Did this SECRETUM allude to that profound secrecy, in which Druids, Goths, Magi, Ægyptians, and Indians, veiled their esoteric doctrines? from such secrecy among the Scandinavians originated the God Vidar, and among the Egyptians Harpocrates:—for Seneca in a similar manner speaks of the secretum loci et admiratio umbræ; and Pliny, "Lucos, atque in iis silentia ipsa adoramus." But the antient Persians had three sorts of temples—common oratories for the devotion of the people, where the sacred fire was only kept in lamps—public temples with altars, on which it perpetually flamed, where the superior order paid their adorations, and in which incantations were practised—and the grand seat

of the Archimagus, to which each was obliged to repair during his life. The Druids had also serpentine temples, and the Celtic sanctuaries were often as in India and Persia near fountains and rivers.

Amongst all these people, the doctrine of a future state of existence was believed. Mr. Davies, in his Celtic mythology, gives a detailed account of the Cauldron of Kêd, or Ceridwen, among the Druids, of which the following is the abstract. Ceridwen prepares for her son a cauldron of water of Inspiration and Sciences, which was to boil for a year and a day for the attainment of three blessed drops of the endowment of the Spirit; various persons were stationed to superintend the process, during which time Ceridwen employed herself in collecting various plants endued with rare virtues for the preparation of it. While she was thus engaged, three drops of efficacious water flowed from the cauldron, and pitched upon the finger of Gwion the little, in consequence of which, he placed it to his mouth, and instantly futurity was revealed to him; but all that the cauldron contained besides was poisonous. The sequel mentions Ceridwen's rage, and the various metamorphoses which Gwion underwent to elude her pursuit. Any unprejudiced reader will perceive, that this is an almost exact transcript of the Brahminical fable, translated by Dr. Wilkins, from an episode of the Mahā-bhārăta; there is also an account of it in the Ramayana, not differing in essential points: and there is still a poem extant in the Myvyrian Archæology enumerating the different plants, of which Ceridwen's liquor was a decoction. The metamorphoses that both Gwion and Ceridwen underwent, are analogous to the Maya of Vishnu; in both narratives the liquor was imbibed by a person, for whom it was not intended, who suffered condign punishment:—in both, the properties of the liquor were the same, and in both there existed poisonous qualities.[1] Captain Wilford instances from the Nasatya Sanhita the pool Abhimatada, which granted every wish, as well as Rupa-yauvana-sthala, or land of beauty and youth; elsewhere this latter is also considered as a pool, and Abhimatada conjectured to be Abydus in Upper Egypt. So the Muhhammedans, whether they borrowed it from these Indian fictions, or from the Rabbinical absurdities respecting the Sabbatic river, believe, that in some remote part of the East covered with deepest gloom and darkest shade

ابزند كاني exists, and that whosoever drinks of it shall not awake until the last trump. Alexander is fabled to have sought it, and Khizzr, his Vizier to have found it: thus the Koranic commenta-

[1] Gwion is the Rahu of Sanskrit Mythology.

tors argue, that Joshua bathed in the water of life, and that some *drops of it falling on a broiled fish restored it to life.* Ferdoosee, in his Shâhnameh, Saadee, and Khosroo, very frequently allude to it: among other such allusions, Hhafezz writes,

حافظ ار آب حیات ابدی میطلبی
منبعش خاک در خلوة درویشان است

And Jamee, in one of his fanciful productions, introduces Moses, as immerging himself in its stream,

جا هبه کند از تن ورد غوط ترآب
تن فرو شد و برآمد شباب

The Bauddhists have the holy water of Anaudat, or No-wa dat, as Dr. F. Buchanan wishes it to be pronounced, and in addition to the Cauldron of Ceridwen, the Druids have somewhat analogous fables respecting the sacred Dee. I have elsewhere adduced the apples of Iduna, wife of Braga in Runiclore, the fountain of longevity of the *Αἰθίοπες Μακροβίοι*, the Chang-seng-yo of the Chinese, the Amrita and Piyupa of the Indian School, and the Nectar and Ambrosia of the Classic Gods, all conferring immortality; but it is worthy of remark, that as Ambrosia is derived from *α* privative and *βρότος*, so the Sanskrit Amrita deduces its origin from *α* privative, and the root MRI, to die. We may discover this universal *μῦθος* in Ovid's relation of the history of Glaucus—

> " Res similis fictæ (sed quid mihi fingere prodest ?)
> Gramine contacto cœpit mea præda moveri
> Et mutare latus, terrâque, ut in æquore niti.
> Dumque moror miroque : simul, fugit omnis in undas
> Turba suas ; dominumque novum, littusque relinquunt.
> Obstupui, dubiusque diu, quæ causa ? requiro :—
> Num Deus, hoc, aliquis ? Num succus fecerit herbæ ?
> Quæ, tamen, has, inquam, vires habet herba ? manûque
> Pabula decerpsi, decerptaque dente momordi.
> Vix bene combiberant ignotos guttura succos,
> Cùm subitò trepidare intus præcordia sensi,
> Alteriusque rapi naturæ pectus amore.
> Nec potui restare loco ; repetendaque nunquam
> Terra, vale, dixi, corpusque sub æquora mersi :
> Di maris exceptum socio dignantur honore.

D. G. WAIT.

In a subsequent Number I shall offer some observations on Sir W. Drummond's version of the Druidical verses in the Myvyrian Archæology, cited by Mr. Davies.

ON THE CÆSURA.

Our habitual disregard of quantity, or, if this expression should sound too harshly, our want of system in the pronunciation of Greek and Latin, has encumbered with fresh difficulties a subject intricate in itself, and perplexed rather than explained by some of its commentators.

By recurring to the first principles of metre, and gradually descending through its stages and varieties, we might hope to obviate all cause of confusion, and although we should not remove the difficulties, at least to ascertain their form and pressure. But such an analysis is incompatible with the limits allowed, and even if sufficient space could be afforded, the undertaking would be of little use, as the necessary information has already been communicated in Mr. Mitford's excellent "Inquiry into the Principles of Harmony in Language."

Unwilling to mutilate, and unable to compress, the observations of that learned and judicious Author, I must content myself with a general reference to his work, and hazard such loose remarks of my own, as may perhaps suffice to show that there is nothing in ancient metre which was not the natural effect of ordinary causes.

Quantity is measured by articulation, and may be referred to a twofold origin.

When a vowel is followed by two consonants, or when a diphthong is used, the syllable thus formed is long by nature; For a longer time is naturally required for its utterance, than for that of syllables differently constituted; and its quantity, being inseparable from the proper articulation of its component letters, is obviously founded on a natural and not an artificial basis.

Where the syllable on the other hand derives its quantity from the continuance of one, and not from the union of many sounds, we must refer to custom, rather than nature,[1] as the vowels have each a long and short sound, and the quantity might accordingly be varied at the option of the speaker, if it were not fixed by rules, partly arbitrary, and partly founded on analogy.

---

[1] Corinthius, however, says (Vide Foster page 31) *ἡ γὰρ θέσει μακρὰ ἑκάστων ἐστὶ τῆς φύσει μακρᾶς ἴσα καὶ τὰ φύσει μακρὰ μείζονα ἐστι τῆς αι διφθόγγου.*

On a correct observance of these distinctions the character of ancient versification was established, and its harmony formed by the skilful arrangement of long and short syllables. But although this primary division into long and short embraced all the metrical properties of syllables, it comprehended rather than developed them, and their proportions and affinities were yet to be specified; for among the long some were longer, and among the short some were shorter than others, and even when the metre was correct to all essential purposes, a practised ear might detect a casual excess or deficiency of quantity.[1]

From the different powers of the consonants and the natural uncertainty of pronunciation, another distinction quickly arose and many syllables were accounted common, and the reader or reciter in determining their actual quantity was guided solely by the metre: of the remaining distinctions some may form the subject of future articles; but for the present I shall beg leave to wave their consideration.

If what I have stated is not erroneous, it will follow that we are not to expect any extraordinary minuteness and nicety of discrimination, in the elements of ancient metre, or to suppose that every aberration from the established forms must be accounted for by some grand and active principle.

Pronunciation itself would be influenced by casual circumstances, by the prevalence or disuse of various dialects, and by gradual though trivial corruptions; and the Poet, conscious of his abilities, and proud of his importance, might occasionally innovate upon the sounder practice of his predecessors. It is true that language does not change so rapidly in a barbarous as in a civilized country. (Note. This is confirmed by a singular fact in Bruce's travels, Vol. 6th. p. 435. Vide Editor's Note.) But it should also be recollected that in the time of Homer, writing was little known or practised, and that Grecian fable was seldom more closely allied to truth, than when it stiled the muses the daughters of memory. A very competent judge has observed, "A complete alphabet of any language is unknown. Before the art could reach perfection, custom has every where fixed the practice."[2] We learn from Plato[3] that the characters which represent the long sounds

---

[1] Dion. Hal. τριῖμα εἰ.

[2] Inquiry into the Principles, &c. page 13.

[3] Τὰς δ' ἐγχωρίους, ἀλλὰ τὰ παλαιὰ, Cratylus. Vide Foster's Essay on Accent and Quantity. Chap. 2nd. I refer to the first Edition.

of e and o were of late origin, and although the earlier Latin Authors marked the length by doubling the vowel, this distinction was subsequently neglected.[1]

We may be permitted therefore to assert generally that as far as the vowels were concerned, an alteration in their quantity did not involve an alteration in orthography, and that in this respect at least no restraint was imposed upon the innovator.

The case was certainly different in the consonants, for when a vowel was long by position its length would be ascertained by the eye as well as by the ear. But even in this case the Greeks were not very scrupulous, for in Αἰγῦπτίους Ἠλἔκτρωνες τἔμνει[2] and in other positions the vowel was occasionally shortened.[3] However

---

[1] Quintilian tells us, "Usque ad Accium et ultra porrectas syllabas geminis, ut dixi, vocalibus scripserunt," Lib. 1. Cap. 7. "The Greeks seem not ever," says Foster, "to have used two short vowels in like manner for a long one: but one character served both purposes." Gray says, "In the Sigean and in other very ancient marbles, Ε is always put for the diphthong ΕΙ as Ἐμὶ for Εἰμὶ, the sound being much the same, and the name of ε ψιλὸν in the alphabet being anciently ει: the famous Ει on the temple of Delphi was written with this one character Ε. See Plutarch. The name of ο μικρὸν in the alphabet was anciently ου. See the Epitaph of Thrasymachus ap. Athenæum, L. 10. and Eustathius ad Inscript. L. 5. Iliados, and the diphthong ου in all inscriptions, till after the death of Alexander, was written with a single Ο. The change is attributed to the accuracy of the Alexandrine Grammarians." 2nd Vol. 4to. p. 111.

It is curious that in Hebrew, where we are told poetry is unconnected with metre, no less than fifteen characters are used to mark the pronunciation of the vowels. But as Bishop Horseley justly observes, "If the Hebrew language had all that nicety in its pronunciation, which the Masoretic points exhibit, it seems almost impossible that men should ever have thought of writing it, as it certainly was anciently written, without vowels in the far greater part." Prosodies of the Greek and Latin Languages, page 5.

Mr. Mitford, who defends the antiquity of the vowel-letters, says, "It seems to be now decided, among the learned, that the vowel-points of the Arabs and Persians were unknown, till after the age of Mahomet, and that the Hebrew points were imitated from them." History of Greece, 1st Vol. 2nd Chap. 3 Sect. Note.

[2] Foster, p. 36.

[3] "Vocales breves sæpissime in mediis vocabulis correptæ sunt ante duas vel tres consonantes, cum quibus non conjungitur ξ, v. 9. ante γδ. δμ. &c." Burgess. Annotatio in Dawesii Mis. Crit. p. 348.

little weight the reader may attach to these considerations, I shall not hesitate to confess that they were strong enough to make me question the power of the Cæsura, and that after much enquiry I have at least succeeded in convincing myself, that this power is fictitious, and that the use of long for short syllables, was not founded on the nature and constitution of the verse, but on the privilege or license of the poet.

Such is my own opinion, which will probably have few approvers. But if they, who differ from me, will take the trouble of examining what I have collected on this subject, they will, I think, find that my conclusion, though not the most critical, is far from being the most improbable.

The Cæsura is generally defined to be that metrical division which takes place when a syllable of the word remains after the completion of the foot, or in other terms, " est ea versûs sectio, quæ post pedem absolutum desinit in syllabam et claudit vocem."

According to the PortRoyal Grammarians[1] it can lengthen a syllable, naturally short, after the first, second, third, or fourth foot, even if it is followed by a vowel. Vossius[2] limits its power to the conclusion of the three first feet, and Clarke[3] in his note upon *βέλος ἐχεπευκὲς* says: " Non modò in fine *Versûs* aut *Sententiæ*, sed etiam in fine *Vocis*, propter *pausam*, quâ vox finitur, syllaba alioqui brevis produci potest.—Fit hoc præcipue in *Cæsurâ*, quia major eò incidit pronuntiationis ictus," &c. The anonymous Author of a curious treatise upon Rhythm adopts a different theory, but we find from the verses,[4] which he quotes, that he draws a nearly similar conclusion.

The reason of this power, according to the PortRoyal Grammarians, " is extremely natural, because, as the ancients pronounced their verse according to the cadence of the feet, and the syllable,

---

[1] English edition. Book 10.

[2] De Arte Grammatica, Lib. ii. Cap. 15.

[3] Iliad A, verse 51.

[4] Quæ jacimus addes E, poeta, ut pleniu' fiat.
Configunt parmam, tinnit hastilibus umbo.
Jamque ferè pulvis ad cœlum vasta videtur.
Alter nare cupit, alter pugnare paratu'st.
Pectoribus inhians, spirantia consulit exta.
Ille latus niveum molli fultus hyacintho.

which thus remaineth at the end of a word, was predominant in the next foot, whose beginning it formed; it ought to receive such a force in the pronunciation, as thereby to sustain all the syllables of that very foot," &c. The anonymous Author lately mentioned refers the origin of this power to the early and intimate connexion of Poetry and Music, and he thus illustrates its operation.

" Versus ut dividerentur, aut saltem ut divisio illa in semipede insignis fieret, opus erat Pausâ, vel Morâ majore, quàm inter elationem et positionem pedis, alioqui requirebat Tenor Ductûs communis.

" Hæc autem Pausa, si eundem tantùm temporis tractum, ac in ceteris pedibus, præstaret, suâ tamen vi syllabam, in quam caderet, necessariò produceret; quia huic syllabæ utcunque brevi Tempus daret longum. At quum eminenter in semipede fieret Pausa, idcirco syllaba hæc quantulacunque longâ longior efficeretur.

" Omnis igitur syllaba in Cæsurâ est longa; nec mirum. Sistitur enim aliquandiu in eâ Dimensio,[1] &c."

Such are the different explanations which are liable to considerable objections. With regard to Clarke's it is observed, " Veruntamen si in fine vocis cujuslibet tanta sit vis Pausæ, quomodo fit, ut in metris Homericis, de quibus agit Vir Cl., ultima pedis syllaba, naturâ brevis, nunquam, quantum scio, ipso judice, vi ejusdem pausæ producatur; quum interea pedis prima syllaba, alioqui brevis, id passim patiatur? Porro si res ita se haberet, primi quatuor pedes carminis Hexametri pro dactylicis Iambi possint evadere aut Trochæi; et actum planè esset de versu Heroico."

Tyrrwhitt, whose opinion is given by the same Author, agrees in thinking that the pause at the end of a word cannot by itself lengthen a syllable, and says, that if the accent is meant by *ictus*,[3] this could by no means lengthen a final syllable which was never accented; and besides the metrical ictus was indifferently used in each part of the foot.

---

[1] Page 147. [2] De Rhythmo, page 40.

[3] "Si causa rogetur, cur hæ syllabæ in Cæsurâ possint produci, Viri docti justam dederunt. Nempe quia mora in illâ syllabâ quædam fit unde et mansio vocatur. Et quia ictus pronuntiationis, ut quidam loquuntur, in hanc versûs partem cadit. J. C. Scaliger in poeticis hoc non semel tradit. Videatur quoque acutissimus S. Clarkius ad Il. A. 51." D'Orvill. Vann. Crit. p. 325. De Rhythmo, p. 143.

Una longa non valebit edere ex sese pedem
Ictibus quia fit duobus, non gemello tempore.
Brevis utrinque sit licebit, bis feriri convenit.

But if Clarke's theory is incompatible with metrical propriety, it does not appear that much will be gained by adopting that of our anonymous Author, who asserts that every syllable in the Cæsura is necessarily long, and that the Cæsura occurs in four out of the six feet. It should also be noticed that Athenæus,[1] who attributes the ἀκέφαλοι, λάγαροι and μείουροι verses of Homer to this connexion of poetry and music, says nothing about the Cæsura.

Definition, "that celebrated remedy," as Burke says, "for the disorder of uncertainty and confusion," has, perhaps, been the cause why the moderns have assigned a power and extent to the Cæsura, of which the ancients were apparently ignorant.

It certainly is "ea versûs Sectio, quæ post pedem absolutum desinit in syllabam et claudit vocem," and this division may, as the PortRoyal Grammarians[2] observe, occur five times in the Hexameter; but that which is essential is more limited in its situation, and somewhat different in its nature. It has been described under various names by several Grammarians, but with a perspicuity which leaves no doubt of their concordance.

The first Incisio, Sectio, Cæsura, or τομή, is called πενθημιμερὴς, and takes place after the completion of two feet, as in

Quam Juno fer | tur

and in

Infandum re | gina.

The second takes place after the completion of three feet, and is called ἑφθημιμερὴς, as in

Infandum regina ju | bes

and in

Quæ pax longa remiserat, | arma.

It is immaterial whether the first Cæsura is formed by one syllable, as in the first instance, or by two, in which case it is called trochaic, as in the second, but in the second Cæsura the trochee, though not altogether inadmissible, ought to be avoided.

To these two we may perhaps add a third, which from its being

---

[1] Lib. 14. Cap. 8.

[2] Book 10. Sect. 3. Chapter 2.

generally used by Theocritus, is called the Bucolic Cæsura, and is formed when the fourth foot is a dactyle, and unconnected in scanning with the remaining part of the verse, as in

Non, verùm Ægonis: nuper mihi | tradidit Ægon.

Whatever, therefore, may be the force and beauty of the Cæsura, it can only affect two feet; and all further extension of its agency will confuse or destroy its character.

If we proceed to investigate the circumstances and qualities which have authorized or occasioned a metrical deficiency in final syllables, we shall derive the following information from the Grammarians. Hephæstion enumerates three species of common syllables, but the Scholiast recognizes twelve, and says, Τρίτος τρόπος κοινῆς συλλαβῆς, ὅταν βραχεῖα οὖσα καταπεραιοῖ εἰς μέρος λόγου, καὶ τὴν ἐξῆς ἔχῃ ἀπὸ φωνήεντος ἀρχομένην.[1] He also mentions that the acute accent, whether before, after, or upon a short syllable, possesses the power of lengthening it. Aristides Quintilianus, in describing the common syllables, says, Αἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν φύσει βραχειῶν, ὅταν εἰς μέρος λόγου συλλαβὴ λήγῃ· ἡ γὰρ μεταξὺ διάστασις τῆς τοῦ προτέρου τελευτῆς, καὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ δευτέρου, μῆκος τῆς συλλαβῆς παρέχεται.

Diomedes[2] allows seven species of common syllables, and adds, "Modus superior quibusdam superfluus visus est quoniam sufficit finitam esse partem orationis. Ex his omnibus modis uno duntaxat uti admittunt, qui metrorum rationum sunt admodum perspicaces."

Servius allows eight species, and in his note upon

Auro gravia sectoque elephanto,

says, "A finalitatis ratione producitur, sed satis asperè, nam in nullam desinit consonantem, ut

Omnia vincit amor, et nos cedamus amori.

et

At tibi, Thymbre, caput Evandrius abstulit ensis.

In another note, however, he does not make this distinction, for he says, "*Que* brevis est pro longa posita; quæ hac ratione defenditur; aut quia omnia monosyllaba ad artem non pertinent, et his licenter uti possumus: aut certè, quia omne μόριον, id est particula, quæ sui substantiam non habet, membrum putatur superioris orationis. Quòd

---

[1] Κεφ. α. See also the extracts from Eustathius, p. 181. Professor Gaisford's Hephæstion, p. 189.

[2] Ditto 208. Putsch. 423.

si est *Liminaque*, quasi una pars orationis est; et potest *Que*, finalitatis ratione, vel produci vel corripi."

Sergius tells us "Communes verò modis novem fiunt," and Maximus Victorinus that a vowel can lengthen the final syllable of a verb or noun, whenever the poet is so disposed. Marius Victorinus allows four; Charisius, five: and Beda, nine species of common syllables; and Terentianus Maurus doubts whether a short syllable may not end the first as well as the last division of the Pentameter.

Such is the latitude allowed by those on whose opinions we ought to place reliance; a latitude which may have arisen from their confounding the exception with the rule, or from the unsettled state of Latin Versification. From whatever cause it has arisen, my present purpose is fully answered by showing that, if we except the finalitatis ratio, there is nothing that has any reference to the Cæsura, even in its legitimate situation. That short syllables frequently occur, when the word is ended, and the foot begun by the same syllable, is undeniable, and at some future opportunity I shall endeavour to account for their occurrence.

As Putschius's collection is very scarce, I have annexed some of the passages referred to.

Diomedes,
De Incisionibus. *Puts.* 496.

"Illud quoque observare debemus, ut in Heroico hexametro Incisiones, quas alii Cæsuras appellant, nonnulli Sectiones nominant, facias, quas Græci rite[1] custodiunt, Incisiones versûs Heroici sunt quatuor. Hæ finitis partibus orationis fiunt, et tali ordine colligentur. Prima est *πενθημιμερὴς*. Secunda est *κατὰ τρίτοι τροχεῖον*. Tertia *ἑφθημιμερὴς*. Quarta *τετραποδία βουκολικὴ* dicitur, quia Theocritus auctor bucolici carminis hac plurimùm esse usus creditur. *Πενθημιμερὴς* est Semiquinaria, ubi post duos pedes et unam syllabam pars orationis expletur. Et ideo *πενθημιμερὴς* vocatur quia quinque pedes dividit sic. *Defecisse videt. Se signari oculis.* Horum residuis partibus trimetri Anapæstici hypercatalecti fiunt tales. *Sua jam promissa reposci. Ultro implacabilis ardet.* Hæc licet accipiat unam brevem, faciet finitâ parte orationis secundam cæsuram. Secunda est *κατὰ τρίτον*

[1] "Observations on the liberty of the Greek versification." PortRoyal Grammar. p. 475. "Their verses are frequently without any Cæsura at all."

τροχεῖον, in quâ, finitâ parte orationis, tertium Trochæum ponas, a quo nomen traxit, ut est, *Infandum regina.* Huic addito Anapæsto vel Spondeo constabit tertia incisio. Tertia ἐφθημιμερὴς, Latinâ linguâ translata Semiseptenaria, scilicet, quia septem dividit, ut est, *Italiam fato profugus. Tum demum movet arma leo. Excutiens cervice toros. Impavidus frangit telum.* Hinc quod remanet, sic contexere poesin potest, *gaudetque comantes. Fixumque latronis.* Huic parti adjiciatur Pyrrhichius, eademque rursus efficit metrum Ionicum. Ἀπὸ τοῦ μείζονος hypercatalectum, tale est, *gaudetque comantes leo. Fixumque latronis leo. Fremit ore cruento leo.* Hæc duabus additis brevibus quartam incisionem efficiet, ita ut quarto Dactylum invenias, ut est. *Inferretque Deos Latio, genus unde Latinum.* Sunt, qui quartum Trochæum in hâc Cæsurâ collocant, et ex eo κατὰ τέταρτον τροχεῖον appellant, ut est, *Quæ pax longa remiserat, arma novare parabant.* Alii vero Spondeum, ut est, *Inde toro pater Æneas sic orsus ab alto.* Ita tamen, ut per omnia ista intervalla, quæ diximus, pars orationis finiatur, remanebit pars versûs, quæ dicitur comma; si priorem habuit Dactylum, dicetur Dactylicum, ut est *Orsus ab alto.* Si Spondeum, Spondaizon appellatur, ut est. *Cornua velatarum obvertimus antennarum.* Hæ incisiones, quas Græci τομὰς appellant, figuris formantur tribus, simplici, compositâ, conjunctâ. Simplex est, cùm invenitur in versu una Incisio, ut, *Panditur interea domus omnipotentis Olympi.* Composita, cum duæ inveniuntur, ut est. *Infandum, regina, jubes renovare dolorem.* Conjuncta, cùm tres inveniuntur, ut est. *Talibus Ilioneus, cuncti simul ore fremebant Dardanidæ.*

The corresponding passages in Terentianus Maurus and Marius Victorinus will be found in Mr. Gaisford's Hephæstion, pp. 268, 9.

In Priscian's commentary upon the initial lines of the twelve books of the Æneid, the Cæsuras are thus marked, "Quot Cæsuras habet? Duas. Quas? Semiquinariam et semiseptenariam. Quomodo? *Arma vi | rumque ca | no Tro | jæ.* 2. Semiquinariam. 3. Semiquinariam et semiseptenariam. 4. Semiquinariam. 5. Semiseptenariam. 6. Semiquinariam et semiseptenariam. 7. Ditto. 8. Semiquinariam. 9. Semiquinariam et semiseptenariam. 10. Semiquinariam. 11. Semiquinariam et semiseptenariam. 12. Semiquinariam.

Sergius says, p. 1830 ——— Sciendum est quòd si et hæc vocalis non desinat in unam consonantem, sed nuda sit, sæpe communem syllabam facit. Est enim longa in hoc: *Dona dehinc auro gravia, sectoque elephanto,* brevis in hoc: *Talia dicta volant.*

Terentianus Maurus. De pentametro versu, qui et elegiacus dicitur.

Quidam (quia gemino constat de commate versus)
Cludere comma prius non timuere brevi:
Ut si pentameter talis, qualem modò fingo,
Hoc mihi tam grande munus habere datur.
Aut qualis supra versus peccare videtur,
Si fiet talis, Incipe Mænalios
.....
Tantam nostra nequit mensura absolvere litem,
Malo tamen longâ cludere comma prius.[1]

Priscian, p. 768.

In Græcis est quando invenimus e productâ finiri ablativum tam primæ quam tertiæ declinationis nominum qui magis dativus est græcus positus pro latino ablativo. Virgilius in primo Æneid. *Ipse uno graditur comitatus Achate.* Lucanus in octavo. *Signaque ab Euphrate*[2] *cum Crassis capta sequentem.* Similiter a Demosthene, Aristotele, Hermogene. Vetustissimi tamen etiam in quibusdam Latinis quæ nominativum in es productam terminant, pares cum genitivo habent syllabas in hac declinatione, solebant producere ablativum more quintæ declinationis vel supradictorum Græcorum, ut a mole, fame, tabe, quod adhuc sic profertur. Virgil. in VI. *effam objicit, ille fame rabida tria guttura pandens.* Lucanus in X. *Non mandante fame multas volucresque ferasque Ægypti posuere Deos.* Juvenalis in V. *Membra aliena fame lacerabant, esse parati Et sua.* Lucretius. *Imbribus, et tabe nimborum arbusta vacillent.* ..... *K.*

---

[1] Heinsius, in his note upon "Quantus in Æacide Actorideque fuit," Ep. Pont. lib. 2. et 4. v. 22. observes, "Hic hiatus insolens est Nasoni."

[2] We may add from Ovid, Te memorant Gange, totoque Oriente subacto. *Fast.* 3. *l.* 729.

ON THE

SAPPHIC AND ALCAIC METRES.

PART II.

In the three last Priapean verses I have made some slight alterations in the words, with a view rather to show the nature of the metre than to restore the genuine text, which is evidently in many places corrupt in the books whence the fragments have been selected.

In Gaisford's Hephæst. p. 60, a Priapean verse occurs with an initial broken quantity, representing a *foot* or half dipodia, as

Τὸν στύγ- | νον Με- | λανίπ- | που φό- | νον αἱ
Πατρο- | φόνων | ἔρι- | θοι,

And again,

Πέτρης | ἐς πο- | λιὸν | κῦμα κολυμβ- | ῶμι θύων | ἔρω- | τι, Ib. p. 130.

If in the line,

Εὐ- | μορφο- | τέρα | Μνασι- | δίκα
τᾶς ἁ- | παλᾶς | Γυρίν- | νως

we omit the second choriamb there remains the following metre:

Κρῆσ- | σαι νύ | ποθ' ὧδ' | ἐμμε- | λέως | πόδεσ- | σιν,
Πό- | ας τέ- | ρεν ἄν- | θος μα- | λακὸν | ματεῦ- | σαι
Τρι- | βωλέ- | τερ, οὐ | γὰρ 'Αρ- | κάδεσ- | σι λώ- | βα,

A short and brisk metre has been formed out of the Priapean verse, consisting wholly of the second section, and resembling the Anacreontic, as

3 | 3 | 3
Μή με | φύγῃς | ὁρῶσ- | α, Anacr. Ode 34.
Lydi- | a dic | per om- | nes.
Ὀλβι- | ε γαμ- | βρὲ σοὶ | μὲν
Δὴ γά- | μος, ὡς | ἀρᾷ- | ο,
Ἔκτε- | τέλεστ', | ἔχεις | δὲ
Παρθέ- | νον, ἂν | ἀρᾷ- | ο,
Μελί- | χροος | δ' ἐπ' ἰ- | μερ-
-τῶ κέ- | χυται | προσώ- | πῳ.

Instead of ἄραο, Dorice, for ἤρασο, from ἔραμαι, which would be destructive of the metre, if not of the rhythm, and inconsistent with the sort of verse, (a choriambic hepthememer, having an iamb and long syllable for its close) of which it is produced by Hephæstion as an example, I would read ἀρᾶο, Dorice for ἀρῷο, the optative passive, from ἀράομαι. The initial α in ἀράομαι is generally long, but Homer uses it short in ἀρὰ, *preces*, and Aristophanes in the compounds κατάρατος and καταρᾷ. When I say that the introduction of ἤρασο for ἀρῷο would be destructive of the metre, if not of the rhythm, it must not be understood that, according to the laws even of rhythm, a dactyl and an amphibrachys may be substituted one for another *universally* and in *all* cases. As single feet, they are incapable of reciprocal substitution, and it is only when they enter into a verse as *parts* of compound and larger feet that such a substitution can happen. To make a dactylic hexameter terminate, for instance, in ἀρῷο πάντως instead of ἤρασο πάντως would be barbarous, intolerable, and an equal offence both to rhythm and metre; but the first section of a Priapean verse, which proceeds not by single feet, but by compound feet, may begin indifferently with a diiamb, or a choriamb, and admits, therefore, either ἀρῷο or ἤρασο equally well, as

⏑	⏑	⏑	⏑	⏑	⏑	⏑	⏑
Ἀ῎ρῳ-	ο νῦν	Παρθε-	νία or	Ἀ῎ρῳ-	ο νῦν	παρθε-	νία
Ἤ῎ρᾰ-	σο νῦν	Παρθε-	νία,	Ἤ῎ρᾰ-	σο νῦν	παρθε-	νία

Here is no offence to rhythm, but still there may be to metre, as metre is sometimes strict, and by no means allows *always* the licence of isochronous and equivalent exchanges. This licence, although not entirely confined to the lyric poets, is chiefly used by them, and may be considered as a characteristic feature of the Greek *Μέλη*, or Odes. A nice observation of these isochronous interchanges may be a means of leading us to the true scansion and division of the dominant rhythm; a subject, either not well understood, or imperfectly explained by the Greek scholiasts, and where an unerring guide is still wanted. On account of the peculiar facility with which *compound* feet admit these interchanges, all feet exceeding three syllables were not, as Cicero tells us, esteemed *feet* so much as *numbers*. See Class. Journ. Vol. III. p. 39 and 54. This is confirmed too by Marius Victorinus, who says, "Non gradiuntur *Μέλη pedum* mensionibus, sed *rhythmis* fiunt." Gaisford's Hephæst. p. 224.

The same metre occurs with a syllable prefixed, as

Δέ-	δυκε	μὲν ἀ	σελάνα,
Καὶ	Πληί-	άδες	μέσαι δέ. Hephæst. p. 65.

Before I quit the subject of choriambics, I will subjoin a scale, and place in it several lines, proceeding from the most simple form

of verse to that which is more complicated, from one middle to two, three, and four middle choriambs.

	1	2	3	4	
1		Εὐ-	ρὼν Ἐ-	πίχαρ	μος.
2		Κάδδ'	ἀμβο-	σίας	μὲν
3		Κρα-	τὴρ ἐ-	κέκρα-	το.
4		Ἐρ-	μᾶς δὲ	Fελὼν	ὅλ-
5		-πιν	Fοινο-	χόη-	σε.
6		Sic te	Diva	potens	Cypri
7	Οὐ γὰρ	οἰκί-	α ἐν	μοισο-	πόλων	θέμις
8	Θρῆνον	ἐμμέ-	ναι, οὐκ	ἄμμι	πρέπει	τάδε
	"Η-	ραν πο-	τὰ φα-	σὶν Δί-	α τὸν	τερπι-	κέραυ-	νον.
9	Sic fra-	tris He-	lenæ,	luci-	da sy-	dera.		Hor. Ib.
10	Καττύπ-	τεσθε	κόραι	καὶ κατ-	ερεί-	κεσθε	χιτῶ-	νας.
11	Ῥοδο-	πάχε-	ες ἀγ-	ναὶ χά-	ριτες	δεῦτε	Διὸς	κόραι.
12	Κρονί-	δα βα-	σιλῆ-	ος γέ-	νος Αἴ-	αν τὸν	ἄρισ-	τον πεδ' Ἀχ
13	Κατῦα-	γοῖσα	δὲ κεῖσ'.	οὐδέ	ποτα	μναμο-	σύνα	σέθεν.	[λε
14	Alphene	imme-	mor atque	una-	nimis	false	soda-	libus.
15	"Εσσετ'	οὐδέ-	ποτ' εἰς	ὕστε-	ρον οὐ	γὰρ πεδ-	έχεις	βρόδων.
16	Jam te	nil mi-	seret,	dure,	tui	dulcis	ami-	culi.
17	Τῶν ἐκ	Πιε-	ρίας,	ἀλλ'.	Pherecratian.			
18	Jam me	prode-	re, jam	non				
19	Ἀφανὴς	κὴν Ἀ-	ΐδα	δόμοις.	Glyconian.			
20	Dubitas	falle-	re per-	fide.				
21	Φοιτάσ-	σεις πεδ' ἀμαυ-		ρῶν.	Pherecratian.			
22	Nec fac-	ta impi-a fall-		acum.				
23	Νεκύων	ἐκπε-	ποτα-	μένα.	Glyconian.			
24	Hominum	cœli-	colis	placent.				

The last six Greek lines (or rather sections of lines as to the last four) of Sappho I have underlined with others from Catullus, in order to show their mutual correspondence. This fragment of Sappho and the Ode of Catullus illustrate each other, and can now leave little doubt as to the true nature, both of the rhythm and of the artificial division of the strophe. Where on a former occasion (Class. Journ. Vol. IV. p. 299.) I mentioned only a strong resemblance between the two odes, I now upon closer examination discover an identity. The composition of the strophe in Catullus is so singular, that although the ode is short, and consisting only of three strophes, yet the presumption is, that the uniformity found in them is such as cannot be accidental. In general the longer an ode is, with the greater certainty we can pronounce upon the principles of its versification. Had the Ode of Catullus consisted only of *one* strophe, a doubt might have existed, whether it ought to be divided into four, five, or eight lines, in the manner in which I had divided the same Greek strophe in a former part of the Class. Journ. Vol. IV. p. 298. The first strophe in Catullus may

be divided into eight lines, or sections of lines, so as to make each line end with an entire word, and the second strophe even admits of the same division; but when we come to the third strophe we find a difficulty, and the line

Si tu oblitus es, at Dî meminerunt, meminit fides,

does not admit of a division into a couplet or duad, like

Nec fac | ta impi- | a fall- | acum ho- | minum
Cœli- | colis | placent. |

The nonconformity of this last strophe in this particular, with the two preceding, may justify a conclusion that it was not intended to be broken into duads. If we consider the strophe as a tetrastich, or as a pentad, we may divide *all* the strophes into either; but then, instead of being too minute, as in the former case, we become too general, and lose sight of those colons and commas into which the art of the poet has broken and divided the metre. For it may be laid down as a rule, that the more curious and elaborately constructed any metre is, the more a uniform adherence to it affords proof of design, and negatives the supposition of accidental concordance. For instance, in the 8th Ode of Horace, in the first book, the second line,

Te Deos oro | Sybarin, || cur properas amando,

is not only divided into two sections, but the termination of the first section is further distinguished by this *invariable* peculiarity, that it has for its close an entire word, or entire words, equal to a trissyllable, forming an anapest, *detached* from the preceding part of the section, as at the word Sybarin. Were any one composing an ode, in imitation of this of Horace, to write

Te Deos orare juvat,

as equivalent to

Te Deos oro | Sybarin,

he would miss his aim, and would agree with his prototype in rhythm only, but not in metre. From what has been said, I think we may conclude, that the right division of the Ode of Catullus is into strophes of six lines as above; and as the Greek strophe of Sappho agrees with the Latin of Catullus in *all* its peculiarities, we may conclude further, that both have been fashioned after one common model. In the language of Hephæstion, this metre is not composed, ἐξ ὁμοίων, but κατὰ σχέσιν. p. 120. Upon the whole, therefore, the Fragment of Sappho and the singular Ode of Catullus admirably illustrate each other. How much is the recovery to be desired of the works of Sappho, Alcæus, Corinna, and the other lyric poets; and what an inestimable treasure should we then enjoy of metrical and rhythmical productions in all their

varieties; for it is examples and grounds for comparison and observation, as much as, or more than, precepts, that are now wanted to assist us in our researches into the nature of lyrical compositions. It is chiefly, indeed, as a repository of the verses of ancient lost poets, that I consider Hephæstion's book as useful and indispensable, especially augmented and enriched as it now is with much new matter, and a most elaborate commentary by the late editor.

It matters not whether the line in Catullus,

Nec facta impia fallacum ‖ hominum Cœlicolis placent,

be written as one line, or be divided into two, provided we understand the nature of the metre, and mark its peculiar comma, and do not confound it with the line in Horace,

Nullam Vare sacra ‖ vite prius ‖ severis arborem,

which, although agreeing with that of Catullus in rhythm, that is, in number of times, has separate and distinct sections, and is, therefore, in effect a different metre. Indeed it is better, perhaps, to write all these long asclepiads as one line, except when we wish to make their peculiar commas, colons, and sections more perceptible, as otherwise it might produce a notion that the last syllable is independent, and need not be elided before the next section beginning with a vowel, a quality that belongs only universally to the termination of a *whole line*, and not equally, and by no means always to a colon, section, or comma. Thus in the elegiac pentameter, although there is always a comma or section at the penthimemer, yet nevertheless it does not admit of an hiatus of a short vowel; but the short vowel is uniformly cut off before another word beginning with a vowel, as

Quam cœpta est, nonamque ‖ edita post hyemem. *Catull.* 92. *v.* 2.

This strophe of Catullus has a Grecian air, and a graceful freedom, while that of Horace is uniform and monotonous, but at the same time probably best suited to the Latin muse, which is more severe, and less flexible, than the Grecian, as I have often observed before, and shall have occasion to observe again when I come to consider the peculiar laws of the Latin Sapphic and Alcaic.

I will now revert to the preceding scale, where I have placed several lines, all exhibiting one or more choriambs placed in the middle. One of these lines, the 7th, is the short asclepiad so frequently occurring in the Odes of Horace, namely,

Οὐ γὰρ	οἰκίᾳ ἐν	μοισοπόλων	θέμις, equivalent to
Mæce-	nas atavis	edite Re-	gibus.

I wish to draw attention to this particular metre, because it appears to me that the catalectic form of it is that which best suits some fragments of Sappho. I will place the entire metre, and then some catalectic examples of it in one scale, thus

	Arsis.	Thesis.	Arsis.	Thesis.	
4	3	3	3	3	
Mæce-	nas at-	avis	edi-	te Re-	gibus,
Postquam	res A-	siæ	primus	ab o-	ris,
Τί με Παν-	διο-	νὶς Ὦ-	ρανὰ	χελι-	δοῖ
Ζαελεξ-	άμαν	όναρ	*Κυπρο-*	γενή-	ᾳ.
Ἀμφὶ λα-	βροῖς λα-	σίοις	εὖ ἐ-	πύκασ-	σε
Ἀπόμοι	θανεῖν	γενοῖτ',	οὐ γὰρ	ἂν ἄλ-	λη.

This first section of an asclepiad forms sometimes of itself a light Anacreontic, as

Μεγάλῳ	δ' ἠύτε	μ' ἔρως	Hephæst. p. 68.
Σικελὸς	κομψὸς	ἀνὴρ	Ib. p. 71.

By the addition of a syllable a longer Anacreontic is formed of the same rhythm, as the pherecratian, as

	3	3		
Παρὰ δ' ἠύ-	*τε Πυ-*	*θόμανδ-*	*ρον*	
Κατέδυν'	ἔρω-	τα φεύ-	γων.	Hephæst. p. 71.
Super al-	ta vect-	us A-	tys.	Catull. Chom. 61.
Ψυχῆς	ἡνι-	οχεύ-	εις.	Anacreon, Fr. 67.
Ἑκατὸν	μὲν *Δι-*	ὸς υἱ-	όν.	Hephæst. p. 66.

We have seen that the long asclepiad regularly consists of three pure choriambics in the middle, bounded at the beginning and end by a dissyllabic foot, as

Ἐνθόν τ' | ἐξ ὀρανῶ, | *πορφυρέαν* | *περρέμενον* | *χλάμυν,*

Sappho affords examples of three dactyls similarly placed, allowing the line to begin with any dissyllable, but concluding it uniformly with a spondee, as

Τίνι τ'	ὦ *φίλε*	*γαμβρὲ κα-*	λῶς ἔϊ-	κάσδω;
Ὁ μὲν	γὰρ καλὸς	ὄσσον ἰ-	δεῖν πέλε-	ταί [σοι].

When there are four dactyls in the middle, preceded and followed by a spondee they make the Sapphic heroic, as

Χρύσει- | *οι ἐρέ-* | *βινθοι ἐπ'* | *ἀϊό-* | *νων ἐφύ-* | *οντο.*

A single dactyl in the middle seems also the characteristic of the Phalæcian metre, or what is commonly called, hendecasyllables, as

Πὰν, Πε- | *λασγικὸν* | *Ἄργος ἐμβα-* | *τεύων.*

Sappho uses the same metre, prefixing only to it a syllable, as

Ἔ- χει μὲν | Ἀνδρομέ- | δα κα- λὰν ἀ- | μοιβάν.

and also the same metre, deducting from the beginning a syllable, as

Πλή- | ρης μὲν ἐ- | φαίνεθ' ἀσε- | λάνα.

Sometimes an iambic penthimemer, or ditrochaic, with a syllable prefixed, precedes, then a dactyl in the middle intervenes, and for a close a trochaic dimeter catalectic, or trimeter catalectic is appended, as in

Ὦ ναξ Ἄπολλον	παῖ μεγά-	λῶ Διός.	Hephæst. p. 80.
Μόλις μὲν ἔννη	λεπτὸν ἔ-	χοισ' ἐπ' ἀτράκ-	τῳ λίνον. Ib. 81.

There is a singular metre in the fragments of Simonides (Gaisford's Poetæ Minores, Vol. I. p. 381. Gaisford's Hephæst. p. 343.) and to be found also in Callimachus, well calculated to illustrate the Sapphic metre, and shew the force of a *dominant middle* foot. It seems composed of a trochaic base, preceded by a broken imperfect foot, containing either one or two times of a choriamb, in the *middle*, terminating always in a whole word, and by way of close, of another trochaic base like the first, as

1 or 2	3	3 or 4	3	3	1 or 2	3	3 or 4
Ἀν-	ωλό-	λυξαν	κισσο-	φόροις	ἐπὶ	διθυ-	ράμβοις
Στρού-	θωνος	υἱὸς	ἅρμα-	σιν ἐν	χαρί-	των φο-	ρηθεὶς
Θῆ-	κανθε-	ὧν ἰ-	οστε-	φάνων	ἔ-	κατι	Μοισᾶν
Hede-	râve	mollem	frugi-	ferâ	reli-	gare	frontem.

Seneca, Delvii, p. 48.

The Sotadean metre exhibits three choriambs with a broken foot of one or two times prefixed, and with a long syllable affixed, as

Τῶν | χρυσοφόρων | οὐδὲ γυναι- | κῶν βαθυκόλ- | πων. Heph. p. 320.

But this metre in the first and second foot is extremely free and licentious, admitting several rhythmical interchanges for the choriamb, namely, a molossus, the same resolved into an ionic, a ditrochee, and a diiamb, of six or seven times indifferently, and lastly, an epitrite. The third foot is more confined, and seems restricted either to a choriamb or diiamb. I will insert here some instances of the most licentious placed in a scale, according to my present mode of scansion.

1 or 2	6 or 7	6 or 7	3	3	
Σοφο-	κλῆς ῥάγα φα-	γὼν σταφυλῆς	πνιγεὶς τέθνη-		κε.[1]
Ἀμ-	φότερα μένειν	οὐκ οἶδεν ἔσ-	τηκε γὰρ οὐ-		δέν.[2]
Ὑπὸ	τοῦ γεννήτο-	ρος κόσμου	κακῶς παθόν-		τες.[3]
Καὶ	τὸ μὴ παρὸν	μὴ θέλειν οὐ-	δὲ γὰρ σόν ἐσ-		τιν.[4]
Τὸν	θεῖον Ὅμη-	ρον λίμος	κατεδα-	πάνη-	σεν.[5]
Ὡς	πένης θέλων	ἔχειν καὶ πλού-	σιος πλέον		σχεῖν.[6]
Μέ-	γας ἐστὶ τεχ-	νίτης τις ἀτυ-	χῆ πε-	ποίη-	κεν.[7]
Ἐκ	τίνος ἐγένου	καὶ τίς εἶ καὶ	τίς πά-	λι γί-	νῃ.[8]

There is but one line among the many collected by Herman, where the *third* foot contains a diiamb of *seven* times, namely

3 or 4

Πολύ- | ποδα φαγὼν ὁ | Διογένης | ὠμὸν τέθνη- | κεν, Heph. 335.

This, if necessary, might easily be corrected into

Πολύ- | ποδα φαγὼν ὁ | Διογένης | τέθνη- κεν ὠ- | μόν.

It appears that the last syllable of each *foot*, when it terminates a *word*, is common in the same manner as at the end of a verse, as in the following instances:

Καὶ	γὰρ κατὰ γαῖ-	αν τὰ κακὰ	πέφυ-	κεν ἀ-	εί. Herm. 335.
Ἀγα-	θὸς εὐφυὴς	δίκαιος εὐ-	τυχὴς	ὃς ἄν	ᾖ. Ib. 336.
Τοῦ	φθόνου λαβεῖν	δεῖ μερίδα	μῶμον	ἔχειν	δεῖ. Ib.
Πλου-	τεῖ τις ἄγαν	ἀλλὰ πάθος	παρέλα-	βεν αὐ-	τόν. Ib.

In the preceding lines I have not divided the two first feet into their respective arsis and thesis, as I do not readily comprehend how a choriamb, which is in the dactylic or even rhythm, can be made to pass into a molossus, which is in the iambic or double rhythm. The one is what is now called common time, and the other triple time.

Perhaps, however, there is here no change of rhythm, but the rhythm is continued, the long vowel suffering what may be called a *mental* and musical diæresis, as the diphthong frequently does a visible and syllabic diæresis. So the Pherecratian line in Catullus, 59, v. 25. Nutri unt hŭmore, is to be scanned as if it were

Nutri- | unt hŭ- ŭmo- | re, and then it answers precisely to Nubit | ali- te vir- | go. This is the licence, perhaps, to which Quintilian alludes, where he says, Tempora etiam *animo* metiun-

[1] Her. De metris, 335. [2] Ib. [3] Ib. [4] Ib. [5] Ib. 336. [6] Ib. 335. [7] Ib. 336. [8] Hephæst. 320.

tur, et pedum et digitorum ictu intervalla signant, *quibusdam notis* (dele) atque æstimant quot breves illud spatium habeat, Lib. 9. The preceding lines are all ἐξ ὁμοίων, but in Gaisford's Hephæstion, and also in Herman there are eight Sotadean verses κατὰ σχέσιν, and of a most curious and elaborate composition, the two first feet terminating in a whole word, as will be best seen by placing them in a scale.

Εἰ	καὶ βασιλεὺς	πέφυκας ὡς	ὄνητὸς ἄκου-	σον.
Ἄν	μάχαρ πτύης	φλεγματίῳ	κρατεῖ περισ-	σῷ.
Ἄν	εὐιματῆς	ταῦτα πρόσου	προβάτιον εἶ-	χεν, κ. τ. λ.

Herman (p. 58.) not aware that a molossus may represent a choriamb finds fault unnecessarily with the following line of Seneca:

Ut pri- | mūm māgnī ‖ natus Age- | noris.

The licence that prevails in the Sotadean verse may serve to explain to us a similar licence which exists in the following Galliambic verses:

4	6 or 7		
Tibi typa-	na non ina-	ni	Herm. p. 343.
sonitu,	mater Deûm,		
Tonimus;	modos tibi-	nos	
tibi nunc;	Semiviri		
Teretem	comam volan-	tem	
Jactant	tibi Galli.		

Here, instead of the diiamb and choriamb, which are the only isochronous interchanges which occur in Catullus, we have, as in the Sotadean verses, a molossus, Mātēr Dēûm, or if Deûm be not contracted into a monosyllable, an epitritus tertius, Mātēr Dĕūm, a molossus resolved into an ionic, tībī gāllī, and an epitritus primus, mŏdōs tībi. I will observe that Mātēr Dĕūm may be esteemed a diiamb, notwithstanding the spondee in the first place; but if this is so, then the *order* reversed, Dĕūm mātēr, forming an epitritus primus, like mŏdōs tībī, contains precisely the same number of *times* as before, and is ἑπτάσημος alike in both cases, and is therefore equally admissible, as we have just seen, in rhythmical compositions.

I will now correct some Sotadean verses, so far as to make them at least metre.

	6 or 7	6 or 7	3 3	
Ῥῆ-	σιν δεδομένην	[τὴν] ἀγαθὴν	φύλασ- σε σαῦ	τῷ.[1]
Ἐνθ'	οἱ μὲν ἐπ' ἄ-	κραισι πυραῖς	νέκυες ἔκειν-	το.
Ἦ-	βην ἐρατει-	νὴν καλόν τ' ἠ-	λίου πρόσω-	πον.[2]

[1] Herm. p. 334. [2] Dionysius de Structura, p. 30.

Dionysius, in converting the Homeric heroic into the Sotadean,

Ὣς | ὁ πρόσθ' ἵπ- | πων καὶ δίφροῦ | κεῖτο τανυσ- | θείς.

introduces into the second foot a dispondee, unless we consider the last syllable of δίφρου as common, as terminating both a foot and a word, and then the second foot would be only an epitritus quartus ἐπτάσημος.

There are many verses that are capable of being scanned into two, or perhaps more, different rhythms; as the Virgilian line,

Cui non | dictus Hylas | puer, ‖ et La | tonia De- | los,

may be scanned into a Glyconian and Pherecratian, forming together a Priapeian, and on the contrary the Priapeian,

Hunc lucum tibi dedico, consecroque, Priape,

may be scanned into an heroic hexameter. If we wish to know which is the rhythm intended by the poet, the company in which it is found is often the best guide. Noscitur a sociis.

Nor is it a mere matter of barren curiosity to be able to ascertain the true rhythm intended by the poet, as in lyrical pieces the distribution of the strophe and antistrophe is regulated according to the rhythm.

Thus for instance, if the Pherecratian line,

Grato | Pyr- rha sub | antro,

consisted of a spondee, a dactyl, and a spondee, it never could, when so scanned, be made to antistrophize, like the same line scanned in *another* manner, to

3 or 4	3	3	
Θέλω	θέλω	φιλῆ-	σαι.
Αἱ Μοῦ-	σαι τὸν	ἔρω-	τα.
Μεσουυκ-	τίαις	πόθ' ὥ-	ραις.
Grato	Pyrrha sub an-		tro.

I shall leave it to others to determine what is the rhythmical character of the following verses, whether they are Sapphics defective in the beginning, or glyconian choriambics hypercatalectic, or to what other metre they are allied, and may belong.

⏑ ⏑ ἐν Δελ-	φοῖς ποτε	Νικο-	λάδας.[1]
⏑ ⏑ ἐξῆς	ἀμ-	φιφό-	ρεις ἐ-	λαίου.[2]
Ille mî par	es-	se De-	o vi-	detur.
Ἐν Δελ-	φοῖς πο-	τε Νι-	κολά-	δας.
Ἐξῆς	ἀμφι-	φόρεις	ἐλαί-	ου.
Cui fla-	vam re-	ligas	comam.	

As we have seen a syllable prefixed to some metres, so the same addition seems to have been practised in the Sapphic, as

Ἰ-	ὁπλοχ' ἁγνὰ	μει-	λιχό-	μειδε	Σαπφοῖ. Heph. p. 80.
Non	urbe cum to-	tâ	popu-	los ca-	dentes. Sen. Delrii. p. 280.

[1] Gaisford's Poetæ Min. V. I. p. 331. N. 71. [2] Ib.

I have in the preceding observations endeavoured to shŏw that it is common to many metres to have some *dominant and conspicuous* foot in the *middle* of the verse, so as frequently to make the end an antistrophe or echo to the beginning, and that in particular it is the characteristic of the Sapphic hendecasyllable, to have a dactyl in the middle, and a ditrochee on each side of it.

ON A PASSAGE OF LIVY.

Livy, after relating the defeat and death of Asdrubal at the Metaurus, and the manner in which it was notified to Hannibal, says: "Hannibal, tanto simul publico familiarique ictus luctu, *agnoscere se fortunam Carthaginis* fertur dixisse: castrisque inde motis," &c. It would seem from this, that it had been observed as a characteristic of the fortune of Carthage, to meet with signal reverses in the midst of success. Probably the observation might be popular among the Carthaginians. It may be not uninteresting to examine how far this saying was verified by facts.

We have little of the early history of Carthage, being only in possession of a few detached facts, as its foundation, the organization of its force by Mago, the death of the Philœni, the escape of Carthage from subjugation to Persia by the refusal of the Tyrians to serve against them, their naval defeat by the Massilians, &c. On this part of their annals, therefore, we can found no reasoning. I will begin therefore with their first recorded invasion of Sicily. We may infer considerable prior successes, of whatever kind, from the magnitude of the armament, and the various nations from which it was collected. The army is stated by Herodotus at three hundred thousand men: of the number of the fleet we have no authenticated account. Herodotus also mentions the countries which contributed to the force. The army, however, was totally defeated by Gelo of Syracuse and Theron of Agrigentum, and the fleet, together with the Tuscan, by Hiero; and but a small part of the expedition appears to have escaped. Seventy years after, they invaded Sicily again with two successive armaments, subdued five of the principal cities, and were near besieging Syracuse, when the ravages of a pestilence reduced them to make terms with Dionysius and the Sicilians; and the distress, to which Carthage and Africa were reduced by the spreading sickness, is said to have been extreme. Soon after, provoked by the atrocious treatment of their countrymen in Sicily, they sent a hundred ships to raise the siege of Motya by Dionysius; which, failing in their enterprize, were followed by an immense force under the same commander, Himilco, leader in a former expedition; who, having conquered nearly the whole island, stormed one quarter of Syracuse, and reduced the rest to difficulties, was, by an epidemical sickness occa-

sioned by the circumstances of the place, and by a masterly attack of Dionysius, compelled to fly with a scanty remnant, leaving the rest to Sicilian vengeance. The Africans, we are told, exasperated by this desertion, marched, to the number of two hundred thousand men, to Carthage, took Tunis, and menaced the city itself; but, wanting able leaders, the disorderly multitude soon dispersed to their several cities.

Passing over some campaigns in Sicily of inferior consequence, we come to the times of Timoleon. The Punic influence was extended at this time very widely in Sicily; and the disorders there, the smallness of Timoleon's force, and the magnitude of that opposed to it, (stated by Diodorus at seventy thousand foot, ten thousand horse, and two hundred ships) might seem to promise almost certain success. Yet, through the interposition chiefly of an unusually violent storm, their army was totally routed at the Crimesus, and with such slaughter, that peace was soon concluded on terms highly advantageous to Sicily. The "fortune of Carthage" appears again in the war of Agathocles; whose expedition to Africa, conquest of the country, and siege of Carthage, while Syracuse itself was invested, are well known, and perhaps gave Hannibal the idea of his descent on Italy. They had again nearly subdued that island, when they were expelled by Pyrrhus. They regained, however, a footing, and their affairs seem to have been flourishing, when the first Punic war broke out. After various turns of fortune, in this contest, the grand naval defeat near Ecnomus, and the descent of Regulus, reduced them to extremity. Yet the tide was again turned by the defeat and capture of Regulus, and the disaster of Claudius Pulcher; and the state of affairs immediately preceding the sea-fight of the Ægates is marked by the observation of Hanno, in the Carthaginian senate (Liv. xxiii. 13.): "Nunquam terrâ marique magis prosperæ res nostræ visæ sunt, quàm ante consules C. Lutatium et A. Postumium fuerunt." I need scarcely mention, in contrast to this, the defeat of Hanno, the submission of Carthage, the horrors of the servile war, and the seizure of Sardinia, and the twelve hundred talents, by the Romans. Yet the conquests and negociations of Hamilcar Barcas and his successors in Spain, gradually repaired the power and resources of Carthage; and the observation above recorded of Hannibal was perhaps never so signally exemplified as in the second Punic war; the grand victories of Trebia, Trasimenus, and Cannæ, and the gradual decay of his mighty army ensuing; the descent of Asdrubal, again threatening ruin to Italy, and his utter discomfiture at the Metaurus, which forced Hannibal to retire to Bruttium, and occasioned the remarkable exclamation related by Livy.

W.

NOTICE OF
OUVAROFF *on the Eleusinian Mysteries.*

No. III. *(Continued from* No. XXVII. *p.* 171.*)*

WE now proceed to the fifth section of M. Ouvaroff's Essay, wherein he examines a very important question: whether the ancients taught in their mysteries that the gods of Polytheism had been only men—and whether their gods had actually been men. Several illustrious writers have supported these two propositions on the authority of Herodotus, Cicero, Diodorus Siculus, and the Fathers of the Church; but other learned antiquaries have opposed this system, which, however, presents itself under a very specious aspect. The Asiatic colonies, that peopled Greece, brought with them the elements of their religious worship; and these elements, confounded with the local notions already established, gave birth to the Grecian Theogony, which afterwards spread itself over so large a portion of the world, and ended by going back even to its original cradle. Thus, by a singular reaction, the Greeks, who received Bacchus from Egypt, gave the name of Bacchus to all the divinities with which he had any analogy: they even discovered in foreign theogonies, such divinities as exclusively belonged to Greece. From this principle resulted the multitude of Jupiters, Mercuries, Venuses, &c.

The Egyptian and Phœnician colonists brought with their religious systems, their languages, and traditions; of which some confused traces may yet be found in the remains of oriental idioms, and under the varied forms of their mythology may be discovered those features which declare a foreign origin.

M. Ouvaroff then notices the two parties which divided alternately the literature and public credulity of Greece. The Epicureans undertook to solve the theological problem by the aid of history. Euhemerus was chief of this party, and the system was denominated the "historical," or "the system of Apotheosis:" it bore also the name of Euhemerus, and this sect regarded the gods as men deified. On the other hand, that system called the allegorical was founded by the Stoics, who through the medium of abstract ideas reduced all the mythology of Greece to a tissue of moral allegories and physical phenomena. But the system of Euhemerus was widely diffused by the Epicureans, and adopted by many eminent personages. Cicero himself appears to have inclined towards it,[1] and the fathers of the church, finding it suitable to their designs, allowed it to subsist.

A passage in the first book of Herodotus is perhaps the strongest authority in favor of this system. The Persians, as we there read, did not raise statues to their Gods, because they did not believe, as

[1] De Natura Deorum, passim.

the Greeks, that "the Gods were born of men,"[1] for thus has generally been interpreted the word *ἀνθρωποφυέας*. We find, however, that Stanley, the learned editor of Æschylus, had already in the seventeenth century, comprehended the true signification of this compound, which he expresses by *humana forma præditos*.[2] Larcher admitted this conjecture into his French translation of Herodotus, in the edition published at Paris in the year 1802; but it had been rejected by Warburton, nor did Wesseling venture to insert it into his Latin version of Herodotus.

To M. Ouvaroff this appears the only correct interpretation; for he says, (p. 74) if we translate "the Persians did not erect statues, as they did not believe that the Gods were born of men;" the sense becomes complicated and obscure; the two members of the phrase no longer depend on each other; and besides, a forced signification is given to the root *φυὴ*, which the dictionaries always explain by *φύσις, statura, status*, (Βλάστησις, αὔξησις ἡλικίας. Suidas.) But if we adopt Stanley's interpretation of *ἀνθρωποφυὴς*, the sense becomes clear and satisfactory; and indeed Herodotus, in the same paragraph, tells us that the Persians adored on high mountains the sun, moon, and elements. Now it is manifest that, as the human form was not given to those objects of their worship, they escaped the statuary's art. Therefore, Herodotus merely wished to express that the Persians had not any images of Gods, because they worshipped immaterial objects which their imagination had not clothed with a human form, as that of the Greeks had done. Thus Herodotus only contrasts the *anthropomorphism*, so characteristic of the Greeks, with the immateriality of Eastern worship. So that far from supporting Euhemerus, this passage rightly understood has no reference to the historical system, designed to undermine all the foundations of the religion of the Greeks, as Cicero himself has allowed.[3]

It is true that the Greeks, confounding their religious notions with those transmitted from the east by Phœnicians, and still more by Egyptians, admitted among the objects of their worship some local divinities, and at the same time several of those extraordinary men whom they honored under the name of demigods.[4] Herodotus expressly informs us, that most of the Gods came from the Egyptian colonies of Inachus, Cecrops, and Danaüs, but that some also came from the Pelasgians, and some that the Pelasgians had borrowed from other nations. Several national heroes among the Pelasgian divinities were possibly historic personages, and so far may be regarded as men deified; but it is contrary to sound reason and all the notions of antiquity that we should suppose the *Deus optimus maximus*, the *Dii*

---

[1] Clio, cap. 131.
[2] Stanley, ad Æschyli Pers. 811.
[3] De Nat. Deor. lib. i. 83.
[4] Herodotus (Lib. II. cap. 50.) has shown that the Egyptians did not render divine honors to heroes.—The class of Demi-Gods is in its origin Grecian.

majorum gentium, to have ever been mortals deified. The inhabitants of Arcadia or of Crete, may have in turn pretended that Jupiter was a native of their respective countries, without any possibility of proving that Jupiter had been a man deified. Homer, to whom we must always apply when treating of Grecian antiquities, Homer, their true source, *principium et fons*, no where indicates the doctrine of Apotheosis—the Gods of Homer differ completely in their nature from his heroes—they belong to a more exalted and powerful class. Can we acknowledge in the father of Gods and of men, in him whose frown causes the universe to tremble, an obscure king of Crete, whose sepulchre was shown in that island? These considerations, says M. Ouvaroff, (p. 81.) will suffice to prove that the historic system is not anterior to Euhemerus, that it is absolutely contrary to the nature of things, and that, accordingly this doctrine was not, at any period, the secret of the Eleusinian mysteries.

In his sixth and last section, our learned author remarks that the mysteries of Bacchus bore a character altogether opposite to that of the Eleusinian: nor can it be expected, says he, (p. 82.) that much conformity should subsist between the wild licentiousness of the Bacchic rites, and the severe character and high destination of the worship of Ceres. Yet the difference will be found to consist chiefly in externals, and wholly disappears if we raise ourselves to the parent idea, the real type of the two institutions.

The principle of both is found in the active force of nature, beheld in the immense variety of its functions and of its attributes. But the story or *myth* of Bacchus, so obscure and contradictory, must be traced to its origin. Herodotus informs us that Bacchus was from Egypt, and that he was the same as Osiris. In Egypt Osiris was the *Demiurgic* power. When Melampus had given him the Greek name of *Dionysos*,[1] and carried him into Greece nearly at the same time that the vine was introduced there, the employment of the new god was restricted to the superintendence of vineyards. But three Bacchuses appear, and these are generally considered as differing one from another, yet M. Ouvaroff is inclined to regard them but as three successive representations of the same idea; that is, of Osiris. The most ancient poets indicate but a single Bacchus; while later writers divide among three, the actions which in former times were accumulated on the head of one. Diodorus Siculus acknowledges three, but one is the Indian Bacchus, (improperly so named) and he omits the mystic *Iacchus*.[2] Three Bacchuses, however, exclusive of the Indian, are acknowledged by Nonnus, who had profoundly studied the *myth* of Bacchus.[3] We may thus describe the first of those three Bacchuses: he was surnamed *Zagræus*, the son of Jupiter and Proserpine. Arrian has confounded Iacchus with Zagræus: this first copy of Osiris resembles in many respects its original. Torn in pieces by the Titans, Bacchus Zagræus represents Osiris

[1] Herod. lib. II. c. 47.
[2] Diod. Sic. lib. III. c. 41.
[3] Isthm. VIII. 3. ed. Heynii, II. p. 847.

killed by Typhon. This Zagræus is the most ancient and oriental of the three Bacchuses. The second is most known as the son of Jupiter and Semele, and he is also called the Theban, the conqueror: his forms are more *hellenised:* he had no direct relation to Ceres, which proves that the union of the mysteries was a work of later ages. Finally, the third Bacchus is the Eleusinian Iacchus; and appears to have been only imagined to consecrate the alliance between the secret worship of Bacchus and of Ceres, towards which tended all the mysteries. Of this association Iacchus is the symbol. By Nonnus this third Bacchus is described as son of the second by the nymph Aura; others represent him as the son of Jupiter, of Ceres, or of Proserpine, which confounds him with Baechus Zagræus. This Iacchus appeared on the sixth day of the mysteries at Eleusis, he is the Διόνυσος ἐπὶ τῷ μαστῷ of Suidas. (See the word Ἴακχος.)

We may conclude from all these premises, that the mysteries of Bacchus were at some unknown period united to the mysteries of Ceres. On the sixth day, says M. de Sainte Croix, the young Iacchus was carried in ceremony from the Ceramicus to Eleusis; and it appears from the hymn of the initiated, according to Aristophanes, that they invited the young Iacchus to join in their dances, or rather to serve as an interpreter between them, and Ceres.[1] The statue of the God was subsequently taken back to Athens. This shows how the secret worship of Bacchus was added to the Mysteries of Ceres.

Several *Mythographs* have endeavoured to discriminate between Bacchus and Iacchus, but in vain: the three Bacchuses being successive imitations of the same model: imitations appropriate to the spirit of the times, and to the local situation of Greece. Eleusis may be considered as the true depository and centre of all the mystic doctrines of Polytheism—and it is evident that very intimate relations must have subsisted between the secret worshippers of the principal divinities. The idea of a *mediator* in Iacchus,[2] bears all the marks of novelty: the ceremonies in honour of him appear a simple extension of the worship of Ceres. Iacchus did not abide at Eleusis, which seems to imply that he did not essentially participate in the mysteries of that place. These circumstances serve to prove a union of the two worships within a given time; a union in some degree symbolized by the admission of Iacchus to the ceremonies of Eleusis. This union once effected, Iacchus is altogether lost in the worship of Ceres.

Polytheism, like Corinthian metal, consisted in numerous and various elements, among which were historical traditions of facts now lost in the night of time; the *symbolizing* in this manner remarkable events is particularly applicable to all connected with the secret worships of different divinities.

The *Esoteric* worship, one of the two great constituent parts of Polytheism, offered various ramifications of which we are totally igno-

[1] Mystères du Paganisme, p. 200.

[2] Aristoph. Ran. v. 40. et seq.

rant. We can only supply the secret history of Polytheism, by supposition.

As the religious annals of the ancient world are mostly obscured by an impenetrable veil, we must content ourselves with discovering here and there a few luminous spots, not serving so much to enlighten our researches, as to show the magnitude of those objects which remain inaccessible to our attempts. It is even probable that the ancients themselves wanted information respecting many points in the different characters of Polytheism; and the various gradations of mystagogy no longer appeared, but under symbols unintelligible to the vulgar; and perhaps an approximation or union, such as that established between Ceres and Bacchus, may supply the place of an historical demonstration.

M. Ouvaroff thinks it highly probable that from the beginning of the Dionysiacs, the functions of the *Hierokeryx* were performed by the chief priest of Eleusis, and that the *Daducus* who assisted at the rites of Ceres, attended equally at the Dionysiacs; on this subject most learned enquirers have agreed in opinion, and the proof is important, as it marks a community between the two worships. A passage of Nonnus is quoted (p. 95.) as fully proving the union which subsisted between the worships of Ceres and of Bacchus. It is this:

> Καὶ μὶν Ἐλευσινίῃσι θεὰ παρακάθετο Βάκχαις.
> Ἀμφὶ δὲ κοῦρον Ἴακχον ἐκυκλώσαντο χορείη
> Νύμφαι κισσοφόροι Μαραθωνίδες· ἀρτιτόκῳ δὲ
> Δαίμονι νυκτιχορευτὸν ἐκούφισαν Ἀτθίδα πεύκην,
> Καὶ θεὸν ἱλάσκοντο μεθ' υἱέα Περσεφονείης,
> Καὶ Σεμέλης μετὰ παῖδα· θυηπολίας δε Ἀναίῳ
> Ὀψιγόνῳ στήσαντο καὶ ἀρχεγόνῳ Διονύσῳ,
> Καὶ τρίταῳ νέον ὕμνον ἐπεσμαράγησαν Ἰάκχῳ·
> Καὶ τελεταῖς τρισσῇσιν ἐβακχεύθησαν Ἀθῆναι,
> Καὶ χορὸν ὑψιτελέστον ἀνεκρούσαντο πολῖται,
> Ζαγρέα κυδαίνοντες ἅμα Βρομίῳ καὶ Ἰάκχῳ.[1]

"And the Goddess (*Pallas*) delivered the child (*the third Bacchus*) to the priestesses of Eleusis. The nymphs of Marathon, crowned with ivy, danced around the young Bacchus: to celebrate his birth they shook the Attic torch at night, and propitiated the God, after the son of Proserpine, (Zagræus) after the son of Semele, (Bacchus the Theban). They instituted sacrifices in honour of the old and of the new Bacchus, and they addressed a new hymn to the third Iacchus. Athens celebrated triple mysteries, and its citizens formed a choir in honor of Zagræus, Bromius and Iacchus." This single passage serves to confirm our conjectures, says M. Ouvaroff, (p. 96.) as it combines all the characters of authenticity. Nonnus, from whom it is borrowed, besides his poetical talents possessed the most profound mythographical erudition, and particularly directed his attention to the story of Bacchus. In the picture which he has left, we may dis-

[1] Dionys. lib. XLVIII. v. 958.

cover the *historical fact*, and *local tradition*, when divested of the colors of imagination. The poet seems to regard Minerva, who places Iacchus with the priestesses of Eleusis, as the symbol of that goddess being the tutelary divinity of the city. It has been shown that Iacchus resided at Athens, and was carried in pomp to Eleusis, on the sixth day of the initiations.

The passage above given from the Dionysiacs of Nonnus has been cited by M. de Villoison; but this learned Hellenist contented himself with explaining it as relating to the three Bacchuses. Neither has he nor M. de Sainte Croix remarked the alliance of the secret worship of Ceres and of Bacchus, which casts such a new light on all the history of the ancient mystagogy.

It appears from a note (p. 97.) that M. de Villoison in his additions to the "Recherches sur les Mystères du Paganisme," the celebrated work of Baron de Sainte Croix, adopted the opinion expressed by another man of letters, who, on the margin of a copy of Nonnus's Dionysiacs, had written these words—"Nonnus certe accurate tres Bacchos distinguit; Proserpinæ, Semeles et Auræ filium. Alii Iacchum cum Semeles filio confundunt—Optime Nonnus qui tres Bacchos tribus Atheniensium Dionysiacis applicuit, quot fuisse auctores passim testantur," &c. (Recherches sur les Myst. III. art. 5. p. 120.)

Notes of considerable extent and importance follow M. Ouvaroff's work in the form of an Appendix, and contribute to illustrate his subject by a multiplicity of ingenious remarks, and numerous quotations. Among these we shall particularly notice one, (occurring in page 106.) given from the Præpar. Evangel. of Eusebius, (Lib. III. p. 115.) which, says M. Ouvaroff, has never before been adduced in proof of the ancient relations subsisting between India and Egypt.—The passage is as follows: Τὸν Δημιουργὸν, ὃν Κνὴφ οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι προσαγορεύουσιν, τὴν χροιὰν ἐκ κυανοῦ μέλανος ἔχοντα κρατοῦντα ζώνην καὶ σκῆπτρον (λέγουσιν.) "The Egyptians, it is said, represented the Demiurgos Kneph as of a blue colour, bordering on black, with a girdle and a sceptre." Here, says our learned author, it is impossible not to recognize the Indian *Vishnu*. From the Asiatic Researches (Vol. III. p. 571.) he proves that Vishnu's colour was a dark blue, and the Sanscrit *Puranas* declare that Egypt was under the special protection of Vishnu. And Mr. Wilford (in the Asiat. Res. vol. XI. p. 94,) informs us that "Osiris of a black complexion, is Vishnu," and the identity is further proved by various quotations. A note (in p. 120.) mentions the destruction of the temple at Eleusis by Alaric, in the year 396.: it had continued uninjured during all the wars of preceding ages: even Xerxes, the declared enemy of the gods of Greece, had respected it, according to Aristides. (Orat. Eleus. tom. I. p. 451.) M. de Villoison copied several inscriptions at Eleusis, (Mem. de l'Académ. des Inscr. tom. XLVII.) and M. de Chateaubriand visited the ruins still remaining of this celebrated place; but it does not appear that he was much struck by their beauty. (Itin. de Paris à Jerusalem, tom. I. p. 571. 163.) We are happy, however, to learn that some English architects have been so successful in their late researches among these interesting ruins, that a scien-

tific combination of the various parts discovered in fragments on the spot, such as pillars, cornices, friezes, &c. they have restored, as we may say, this admirable edifice to its original state, and the engravings made from their drawings, which the Dilettanti Society are now preparing for publication, will represent its façades, porticoes, and roof, besides the ground plan.

The title page of M. Ouvaroff's essay, exhibits the device on a gem hitherto inedited, and a vignette at the head of the first section is copied from M. Millin's work on Antique Vases, (tom. II. pl. xxxi.) both relating to Triptolemus and Ceres. A *fleuron*, terminating the sixth section, represents Ceres sitting on a stone, of which one side shows the heads of Brahmah, Vishnu, and Siva, or Mahadeva, as sculptured in the famous temple of Elephanta; and the other side an image of Isis from an Egyptian brick, in the cabinet of Count Caylus. (Recueil d' Antiq. tom. I. pl. xv. No. 4.)

Our limits will not allow a more detailed account of this most valuable work, nor of the notes with which it is illustrated, and which occupy above forty pages. We have already announced (in the last Number of our Journal,) that an English translation with some remarks by a distinguished antiquary, who has discussed the same subject on former occasions, might be shortly expected. But we must not close M. Ouvaroff's volume without extracting a passage, (from p. 139.) wherein the learned author congratulates the present race of men on living at a time when the human mind soars above the labyrinth of popular worships, in which the ancients wandered; and this, he says, is perhaps the only point in which we possess any advantage over the ancients; but this advantage is immense: "Every thinking man," adds he, "should now regard himself as fortunate in having been born under the empire of a religion purely intellectual, equally accessible to a shepherd and to a Newton, and of which the character is equally divine as the origin. We feel, on giving up ourselves to these considerations, that sort of pride and satisfaction which an Englishman ought to feel when he compares the constitution of his country with the despotic governments of the East, which have this in common with the false religions, that they degrade man while they corrupt him."

SOME OBSERVATIONS

On the Worship of Vesta, and the Holy Fire, in Ancient Rome: with an account of the Vestal Virgins.

BY G. H. NOEHDEN.

PART I.

THE worship of Vesta was of such remote antiquity, that the Romans themselves seem to have been ignorant of its origin, and primary intention. A variety of uncertain notions were entertained concerning it. Nor does it even appear, that the nature and attributes of that deity

were sufficiently understood. In collecting the intimations, which are to be found on this subject, in the ancient writers, I have been led to conclude that the prevailing opinions respecting this worship may be reduced under the following two heads: 1. That it was either instituted as a memorial of incipient civilization, and of the foundation of domestic life: or 2. that it had a mysterious philosophical signification, relating to the earth and the universe at large. It is not my design to espouse either of those opinions, or to raise an hypothesis of my own; I merely intend to lay before the reader some materials, which I have gathered, and to facilitate the labor of those, who may be inclined, and qualified, to enter into a more profound disquisition.

I shall first produce some particulars, which tend to favor the supposition, that Vesta represented the comforts of civilized and domestic life. The name itself seems to be related to the Greek word ἑστία, the same in meaning as ἐσχάρα, a *Hearth*. Indeed, that deity is, in Greek, expressed by the very same term, Ἑστία. Hence it might be inferred, that Vesta was concerned with the *Hearth*, and the interior of the house; that the comforts of domestic life were placed under her protection. To corroborate this idea, we find her in connexion with the *Penates*, or household gods. In Virgil, Æn. ii. 293., when Æneas is charged with the care of the Trojan Penates:

Sacra suosque tibi commendat Troja *Penates*,

it is added 297.:

Sic ait, et manibus vittas, *Vestamque* potentem,
Æternumque adytis effert penetralibus ignem.

Ovid, Metamorph. xv. 864., likewise mentions her among the Penates:

Vestaque Cæsareos inter sacrata *Penates*.

And Macrobius, Saturn. iii. 4., distinctly observes, that Vesta did belong to the *Dii Penates*, at least was often worshipped in company with them; and he adds: 'adeo ut et consules, prætores, seu dictatores, cum adeunt magistratum, Lavinii rem divinam faciant *Penatibus pariter et Vestæ*.'

As the Penates were supposed to have been imported into Italy by Æneas, so Vesta was thought to be derived from Troy. This is intimated, in the foregoing passage of Virgil: the goddess is hence, by Ovid, called *Vesta Iliaca*, Fast. vi. 265.; and her sacred hearth *Iliaci foci*, ib. 456. She seems to have been first established at Lavinium, which was the primitive settlement of the Trojans in Italy. For this reason, according to Macrobius, just quoted, the higher magistrates of Rome, on entering upon their offices, sacrificed to the Penates, and to Vesta, at Lavinium. From Lavinium the same worship was carried to *Alba Longa*, the second Trojan colony. Livy, i. 20.: 'Alba oriundum sacerdotium.' And, at last, it was permanently fixed at Rome. To the Trojan origin it is owing, that Vesta is coupled with the Palladium, which exclusively belonged to the history of Troy. There are several representations of Vesta to be seen on ancient medals, with the Palladium in her hand. Some are exhibited by Mont-

faucon, *Antiquité Expliquée*, T. i. p. 64. And from Ovid, Trist. iii. 1. 28.

Hic locus est Vestæ, qui *Pallada* servat et ignem,

it might be concluded, that a figure of the Palladium was preserved in the temple of Vesta, at Rome; if this notion were not to be considered as erroneous, from another passage of that poet, in which he seems to correct his mistake. Fast. vi. 295.

Esse diu stultus Vestæ simulacra putavi,
Mox didici curvo nulla subesse tholo.
Ignis inextinctus templo celatur in illo,
Effigiem nullam Vesta nec ignis habet.

Ovid, it seems, had imagined, that in the temple of Vesta, which none but persons consecrated were allowed to enter, there were certain statues, or figures: and though this is, in the first instance, strictly to be understood of the effigy of Vesta herself, yet it appears, at the same time, to exclude any representation whatsoever, and consequently also that of the Palladium,

Effigiem nullam Vesta, nec ignis, habet. 298.

Montfaucon, on the authority of Diodorus Siculus, attributes to Vesta the invention of building houses. Supplément, T. i. p. 65.: 'C'est Vesta, dit Diodore de Sicile, p. 336, qui a inventé l'architecture des maisons, et c'est en reconnoissance de ce bienfait qu'on la trouvoit presque dans toutes les maisons, où l'on lui offroit des sacrifices. C'est peut être pour cela qu'on trouve tant d'images de cette déesse, &c.'

The foregoing data certainly justify the conjecture, that Vesta might have been regarded as the patroness, and protectress of domestic life. In the requisites and comforts of this life, *the Fire* is a most essential ingredient, and was, therefore, together with that goddess, not an unfit object of veneration. Ovid, Fast. vi. 305, says:

Ante focos olim longis considere scamnis
Mos erat; et mensæ credere adesse deos.

Vesta and the *Hearth* conveyed an image of that state of social life. Dionysius Halicarnassensis informs us, that the Roman people used to sacrifice, by their Curiæ, on *hearths*, and that Numa, without removing those particular hearths, or altars, comprehended the religious duties, thus performed, in one general worship, namely, that of Vesta. The passage is Antiq. Rom. ii. c. 66. (ed. Reisk. p. 376. Vol. i.) Νομᾶς δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν παραλαβὼν, τὰς μὲν ἰδίας οὐκ ἐκίνησε τῶν φρατριῶν ἑστίας, κοινὴν δὲ κατεστήσατο πάντων μίαν, ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ τοῦ τε Καπιτωλίου καὶ τοῦ Παλατίου χωρίῳ. "When Numa undertook the government, he did not remove the hearths of the Curiæ, but established one common hearth for all, in the place between the Capitol, and the Palatine hill." This common hearth was in the temple of Vesta. As such it is considered by Cicero, who (de Legg. ii. 12.) remarks: 'Cumque *Vesta quasi focum urbis*, ut Græco nomine est appellata, (quod nos quoque idem Græco interpretatum nomen tenemus) complexa sit; ei colendæ virgines præsint, ut advigiletur facilius ad custodiam ignis.' And in the same book, chap. viii. he expresses himself thus: 'Virgines Vestales in urbe custodiunto ignem *foci publici* sempiternum.'

In the former statements we might acquiesce, and be satisfied with the explanations thus afforded concerning Vesta, if some other opinions, in which the ancients indulged, did not attract our attention, and bring us back to a state of uncertainty. Ovid, who (in Fast. vi. 249, and the following verses) endeavours to elucidate this subject, proposes his conceptions with much poetical versatility, but arrives at no consistent result in the end. He was unable to withdraw the mysterious veil, which was thrown over that deity. He says, v. 253.:

Non equidem vidi (valeant mendacia vatum)
Te, Dea, nec fueras aspicienda viro:
Sed quæ nescieram, quorumque errore tenebar,
Cognita sunt, nullo præcipiente, mihi.

He then enters into some perplexing speculations, which, however, soon render him uneasy, so that he finds it necessary to relieve himself by falling into some light narrative, more congenial with his disposition. The first notion, which he starts, is: 'Vesta eadem est quæ Terra,' Fast. vi. 267. This idea was received by many. It is alluded to by Plutarch, in Numa, c. xi.: *τῆς γῆς ὡς Ἑστίας οὔσης, as if Vesta were the Earth.* The first argument, used by the poet, to prove that identity, is: 'subest vigil ignis utrique.' *Both Vesta and the Earth contain an everlasting fire;* in other words, *Vesta denotes the seat of fire, and the Earth likewise denotes the seat of fire.* Fast. vi. 267.:

Vesta eadem est quæ Terra: subest vigil ignis utrique.
Significant sedem Terra, Focusque suam.

That the second line is to be translated, as we have done above, will not be doubted. *Sedem suam* stands for *sedem ejus*, namely *ignis*. It is known to the philologist, that *suus* is sometimes thus used. The obvious meaning of the earth's containing fire, or being the seat of fire, would seem to be, that the seeds and principles of that element are lodged in the earth. But there is another interpretation, which Montfaucon, *Antiquité Expliquée*, T. i. p. 60., has derived from Dionysius Halicarnassensis (II. c. lxvi. p. 376. ed. Reiske,) and which he gives in these words; 'Denys d'Halicarnasse dit de même, que Vesta est la Terre, et que le feu lui est consacré, parceque comme la Terre occupe le milieu du monde, elle entretient le feu qui est au dessus de la region de l'air.' The Greek words are: Ἑστίᾳ δὲ ἀνακεῖσθαι τὸ πῦρ νομίζουσιν, ὅτι γῆ τε οὖσα ἡ θεὸς καὶ τὸν μέσον κατέχουσα τοῦ κόσμου τόπον, τὰς ἀνάψεις τοῦ μεταρσίου ποιεῖται πυρὸς ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς. This is a very abstruse doctrine, in the discussion of which I do not think it proper to consume any time. I will only remark, that from a supposed connexion of both Vesta and Terra with the element of fire, the poet infers, that the one of those objects is a copy of the other, that, in fact, they both signify the same. In this notion Dionysius Halic. in the passage just quoted, supports him. The similarity of the form, in which the temple of Vesta was built, to the natural shape of the earth, is the second ground on which Ovid proceeds. Plutarch, as we shall afterwards see, objects to this. That form was round, or rather globular. Hence it is said, v. 269., 'Terra pilæ similis,' and 281., 'Par facies templi.' We

is at great pains to demonstrate the rotundity of the earth; and in the course of his details a curious circumstance is incidentally offered to our notice, that the ancients seem to have had artificial representations, ascribed to Archimedes, of the System of the Universe, similar, I conceive, to certain astronomical exhibitions, known in our days. Fast. vi. 277.

Arte Syracosiâ suspensus in aëre clauso
Stat globus, immensi parva figura poli.
Et quantùm a summis, tantùm secessit ab imis
Terra: quod ut fiat, forma rotunda facit.

The system of the universe (*mundus*, v. 275.) is here denominated *immensus polus*, of which the earth, though the centre point, (*medium onus*, v. 276.) was but a small part, *parva figura*.

The mythological digressions, v. 285. and the following, of Ovid, I pass over. From the theory, which he had assumed, that Earth and Vesta were the same, he seems to deviate, v. 291., by saying that Vesta merely represented the fire.

Nec tu aliud Vestam, quam vivam intellige flammam.

But he returns to it v. 298., and finds another ingenious argument, of a grammatical description. *Vesta*, he maintains, had acquired her appellation *from standing fast*, 'vi stando;' because the Earth, with which Vesta is identically the same, has a firm and solid foundation. 'Stat vi Terra suâ.' It cannot be denied that the Greek name Ἑστία, may be subjected to a similar etymology, ἱστάναι, sistere, or στῆναι, stare: Causaque par Graii nominis esse potest. v. 300.

The poet, however, remains involved in contradiction. For he had given himself much trouble, in the foregoing verses, to impress the idea, that the Earth was suspended in the midst of the Universe, and balanced in that position, by the aid of its round form; v. 268.:

Terra pilæ similis, nullo fulcimine nixa,
Aëre subjecto tam grave pendet onus.
Ipsa volubilitas libratum sustinet orbem;
Quique premat partes angulus omnis abest. &c.

And now again he makes it stand firmly, and rest on something like a solid basis. It would have been better for his purpose if he had fallen in with another mode of explaining the name. I have seen it deduced from the Chaldaic *Estha*, fire, which would be more suitable, if this had been within the reach of Ovid's knowledge.

I have, with sufficient length, dwelt on that passage of Ovid, and shown, that he had no well grounded notions upon the subject. This, I believe, was the case with the Romans, in general, and even those, who ought to have been in the secret, I mean the Vestals, and the Pontiffs, were equally uninformed. The whole of the worship hence wore a mysterious appearance, as it was not known what exactly it had for its object. To this, I am inclined to think, was to be traced the pretended secrecy, with which it was carried on. 'Dea non aspicienda viro.' Ovid, Fast. vi. 254. From this source proceeded the *Penetralia* (Horat. Epist. ii. 2. 114.), the *Adyta* (Ovid, Fast. vi. 438.), and the *Adyta Penetralia* (Virg. Æn. ii. 297.) Hence that

reserve of sanctity, which became proverbial, and denoted every thing, that was not to be profaned, not to be touched in an unhallowed manner. Thus, Ausonius, Grat. Act. p. 547. ed. Delphin. in complimenting the Emperor, whom he addresses, says: 'Operto conclavis tui non sanctior ara Vestalis.' And in this sense is to be explained the passage in Horat. Epist. ii. 2. 113. and 114.:

quamvis invita recedant,
Et versentur adhuc intrà penetralia Vestæ,

Signifying, 'that a writer's compositions should be submitted to the correcting hand, though the task of blotting out might be painful, and that which has been written, still be regarded with too much veneration to be meddled with.'

Without incurring the responsibility of an hypothesis, I may perhaps be allowed to say, that, notwithstanding the assertions of Ovid, the Fire seems to have been not the secondary, but the principal object in this worship. To this point every thing which has been adduced appears to tend. In that view, it may be supposed to bear an affinity to the religious practices, which prevailed in different parts of the world. Several nations of the East, the Chaldeans, Persians, and others, held that element in religious veneration. The Egyptians were not exempt from a similar opinion, and even among the Jews some vestiges of it are to be found. In Leviticus c. xii. it is said: 'And the fire upon the altar shall be burning in it, it shall not be put out: and the priest shall burn wood on it every morning.' V. 13. 'The fire shall ever be burning upon the altar: it shall never go out.' In Greece, an everlasting and holy fire was kept at Athens, and at Delphi. This is mentioned by Plutarch, Numa, c. ix. *πῦρ ἀσβεστόν ἐστι —Πυθοῖ καὶ Ἀθήνῃσι*, "there is an unextinguished fire at Delphi and Athens." He subsequently calls this fire *ἱερὸς λύχνος*, "the holy lamp."

Let us now proceed to consider a passage of Plutarch, in which that author furnishes us with his notions, in regard to this matter. It is in the Life of Numa, c. xi. *Νουμᾶς δὲ λέγεται καὶ τὸ τῆς Ἑστίας ἱερὸν ἐγκύκλιον περιβαλέσθαι τῷ ἀσβέστῳ πυρὶ φρουράν· ἀπομιμούμενος οὐ τὸ σχῆμα τῆς γῆς ὡς Ἑστίας οὔσης, ἀλλὰ τοῦ σύμπαντος κόσμου, οὗ μέσον οἱ Πυθαγορικοὶ τὸ πῦρ ἱδρῦσθαι νομίτουσι, καὶ τοῦτο Ἑστίαν καλοῦσι, καὶ μονάδα· τὴν δὲ γῆν, οὔτ' ἀκίνητον, οὔτ' ἐν μέσῳ τῆς περιφορᾶς οὖσαν, ἀλλὰ κύκλῳ περὶ τὸ πῦρ αἰωρουμένην, οὔτε τῶν τιμιατάτων οὐδέν, οὔτε τῶν πρώτων τοῦ κόσμου μορίων ὑπάρχειν. Ταῦτα δὲ καὶ Πλάτωνά φασι πρεσβύτην γενόμενον διανενοῆσθαι περὶ τῆς γῆς, ὡς ἐν ἑτέρᾳ χώρᾳ καθεστώσης, τὴν δὲ μέσην καὶ κυριωτάτην ἑτέρῳ τινὶ κρείττονι προσήκουσαν.* "Numa is farther said to have built the temple of Vesta in a round or circular form, as a cover and guard for the eternal fire; representing, by that particular structure, not the figure of the earth, supposing the earth to be the same as Vesta, but the system of the whole universe, in which, according to the doctrine of the Pythagoreans, the fire occupies the centre. That fire they call *ἑστία* or *μονάς*, (the fixed or cardinal point); and they think, that the earth is neither immoveable, nor stationed in the middle of the system, but that it is

carried, by a circular motion, round the central fire: moreover, that it is far from being the most important, or principal part of the worldly system. It is reported, that Plato, in his advanced age, entertained the same notions concerning the earth, and that he did not think it to be where it was commonly supposed to be fixed, but that the centre, or principal place, belonged to some other, and superior, object."

This is, indeed, a near approach to the Copernican System, and to those exalted truths, which the science of modern times has been so fortunate as to discover! That passage is very remarkable.

The holy fire, in the temple of Vesta, was never suffered to expire, or to be extinguished: it was thence characterised by the epithets, *everlasting, eternal, immortal, unextinguished, ever watchful.* 'Ignis sempiternus,' Cic. de Legg. ii. 8. 'æternus,' Val. Max. i. 1. 6. πῦρ ἀθάνατον, Plutarch. Numa, c. ix. 'Ignis inextinctus,' Ovid. Fast. vi. 297. πῦρ ἀσβεστὸν, Plutarch. 'vigil ignis,' Ovid. Fast. vi. 267. Vesta herself is, by Ovid, Fast. vi. 334. called 'ignea:' and by Horace, Od. iii. 5. 11. 'æterna.' A medal, given by Montfaucon, Supplem. T. i. p. 66. exhibiting Vesta, bears the inscription 'Æternitas.' By Virgil, Æn. ii. 297. she is styled 'potens;' a denomination which may originally have been derived from the power of the element she represented: unless the interpretation of Macrobius, Saturn. iii. 4. is to be preferred, stating, that she is so distinguished as being in the number of the greater deities, the δυνατοὶ θεοί.

The fire was kept on a place, called the *hearth,* or the *altar.* This seems to be liable to no doubt. Plutarch. Numa, c. ix. calls it βωμός: περὶ τὰ Μιθριδατικὰ καὶ τὸν ἐμφύλιον Ῥωμαίων πόλεμον ἅμα τῷ βωμῷ καὶ τὸ πῦρ ἠφανίσθη, "about the time of the Mithridatic affairs, and the civil war of the Romans, the holy fire disappeared, together with the altar." Auson. Grat. Act. p. 547. ed. Delphin. 'Ara Vestalis.' Macrob. Saturn. i. 12. 'Aræ Vestæ.' Cicero, de Legg. ii. 8. and 12. terms it 'Focus;' and under this appellation it repeatedly occurs, in the passage of Ovid above quoted, viz. Fast. vi. 301. 305. 315. 317. 456. Upon this hearth, or altar, I conceive, the fire was maintained by means of wood. Montfaucon seems not to have been aware of the information, contained in those quotations; for he is uncertain whether the holy fire was not preserved in a lamp. In Vol. i. of his Antiquities, p. 64. Pl. xxvii., he exhibits a lamp, of a peculiar shape, with the inscription, Vesta, and asks: 'Etoit-ce la forme de celle où l'on conservoit le feu sacré? Cela pourroit être: mais on n'oseroit l'assurer.' I have met with nothing in any author, which could lead to that idea, except it were the passage of Plutarch, Numa, c. ix. where, speaking of the sacred fire at Athens, and that at Delphi, he says that the ἱερὸς λύχνος was put out at the time of some particular event: but mentioning, immediately after, the fire of Vesta, he abandons the expression λύχνος, and uses that of πῦρ. Consequently, if it be right to infer from that passage, that the sacred fire both at Athens, and at Delphi, consisted in a burning lamp, still we are not justified to apply the same conclusion to the fire of Vesta.

The Vestal fire, though constantly kept alive, was renewed every year, on the first day of March. This intelligence is furnished by Macrobius, Saturn. i. 12. 'Hujus (mensis, scil. Martii) prima die ignem novum Vestæ aris accendebant: ut incipiente anno cura denuo servandi novati ignis inciperet.' The first of March was the commencement of the ancient Roman year, as is known from the authority of Plutarch, Numa c. xviii., besides what Macrobius alleges.

It might happen, that, by some casualty, the holy fire was extinguished, and must be lighted again. This then was not to be done by the common and vulgar method: but it was to be rekindled by fire, immediately derived from heaven. Plutarch. Numa c. ix., speaking of the Vestal fire, adds: *ὅ φασι μὴ δεῖν ἀπὸ ἑτέρου πυρὸς ἐναύεσθαι, καινὸν δὲ ποιεῖν καὶ νέον, ἀνάπτοντας ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου φλόγα καθαρὰν καὶ ἀμίαντον*; "which fire, they say, is not to be lighted from another fire, but must be revived, and renewed, by kindling a pure and unpolluted flame from the sun."

For that purpose a peculiar mirror was generally employed, by Plutarch called *σκαφεῖον*. It seems to have been formed of a piece of metal, in the shape of an equilateral rectangular triangle, which was wrought concave. What the metal was, we are not told. The word *σκαφεῖον* denotes a spade, or shovel, and the mirror may have been so denominated from the resemblance of its form to the shape of that instrument. Plutarch describes it thus: *Ἐξάπτουσι δὲ μάλιστα τοῖς σκαφείοις, ἃ κατασκευάτεται μὲν ἀπὸ πλευρᾶς ἰσοσκελοῦς ὀρθογωνίου τριγώνου κοιλαινόμενα, συννεύει δ' εἰς ἓν ἐκ τῆς περιφερείας κέντρον*: "They generally light the fire by means of the *Scaphia*, which are made by the side (or rather surface) of an equilateral rectangular triangle being excavated (or rendered concave) in such a manner, as to verge, from all directions, towards the centre." There may originally have been a meaning attached to that particular shape. The action of the sun upon the mirror is then accurately delineated: *Ὅταν οὖν θέσιν ἐναντίαν λάβῃ πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον, ὥστε τὰς αὐγὰς πανταχόθεν ἀνακοπτομένας ἀθροίζεσθαι καὶ συμπλέκεσθαι πρὸς τὸ κέντρον, αὐτόν τε διακρίνει τὸν ἀέρα λεπτυνόμενον, καὶ τὰ κουφότατα καὶ ξηρότατα τῶν προστιθεμένων ὀξέως ἀνάπτει, κατὰ τὴν ἀντέρεισιν, σῶμα καὶ πλῆγὴν πυρώδη τῆς αὐγῆς λαμβανούσης*: "when, therefore, the mirror is placed in a position facing the sun, so that the rays, being reflected from all sides, are gathered and united at the centre, it rarifies and dissipates the air, and quickly kindles any very light and dry material, when brought near it, because, in consequence of the reflection, the rays obtain the consistency and power of fire."

ADVERSARIA LITERARIA.

No. XI.

JULII PHÆDRI
FABULÆ NOVÆ.—(PARS II.)

FABULA VIII.

Oraculum Apollinis.

UTILIUS nobis quid sit, dic, Phœbe, obsecro,
Qui Delphos et formosum Parnassum incolis:
Quando sacratæ Vatis horrescunt comæ,
Tripodes moventur, mugit adytis Religio,
Tremuntque lauri, et ipse pallescit dies.
Voces resolvit acta Pythia numine,
Docetque gentes Delii monitus Dei:
Pietatem colite; vota Superis reddite;
Patriam, parentes, natos, castas conjuges
Defendite; armis hostem et ferro pellite;
Amicos sublevate; miseris parcite;
Bonis favete; subdolis[1] ite obviàm;
Delicta vindicate; cohibete impios;
Punite turpi thalamos qui violant stupro;
Malos cavete; nulli nimiùm credite:
Hæc elocuta concidit[2] Virgo furens;
Furens profectò; nam quæ dixit, perdidit.[3]

FABULA IX.

De malo Scriptore se laudante.

ÆSOPO quidam scripta recitârat mala,
In quis ineptè multùm se jactaverat:

---

[1] Ite obviàm subdolis, *id est*: Date operam ne vos dolosi homines circumveniant. Ire obviàm est veluti antevertere dolos.

[2] Concidit; in terram corruit, quod reverà fiebat; haud enim diu furorem illum incredibilem ferre poterat.

[3] Perdidit: incassum edidit, frustra protulit.

Scire ergò cupiens quidnam sentiret Senex:
Numquid tibi, inquit, sum visus superbior?
Haud vana[1] nobis ingenii fiducia est.
Confectus[2] ille pessimo[3] volumine:
Ego, inquit, quòd te laudas vehementer probo;
Namque hoc ab alio nunquam continget tibi.

FABULA X.

Pompeius et Miles.

Magni Pompeii Miles vasti corporis
Fractè loquendo,[4] et ambulando molliter,
Famam Cinædi[5] traxerat certissimam.
Hic, insidiatus nocte, venientes Ducis
Cum veste et auro, et magno argenti pondere,
Avertit mulos. Factum rumor distulit;
Arguitur Miles. Rapitur in prætorium.
Tunc Magnus: Quid ais? Tune me, Commilito,
Spoliare es ausus? Ille continuò exscreat[6]
Sibi in sinistram, et sputum digitis[7] dissipat.
Sic, Imperator, oculi exstillescant[8] mei,
Si vidi aut tetigi. Tum Vir animi simplicis,
Id dedecus[9] castrorum propelli jubet,
Nec cadere in illum credit tantam audaciam.
Fortè intercessit prælium, et fidens manu
Romanos armis provocabat Barbarus.

---

[1] Haud vana, etc. Haud temerè ingenii nostri viribus confidimus. *Virgilius* ait: Fiducia generis; *Ovidius*: Fiducia formæ, pedum; *Quintilianus*: Fiducia memoriæ.

[2] Confectus, *id est*: Pene occisus.

[3] Pessimo, *id est*: Ineptissimo.

[4] Fractè loquendo. Vox fracta plenæ et integræ ac virili opponitur. Ea est quæ mulierculis delicato quodam flexu ducitur.

Almæ nutricis blanda atque infracta loquela. Lucret.

[5] Famam Cinædi. Mollis et effeminati hominis.

[6] Exscreat. Exscreare est sputum ejicere.

[7] Digitis sputum dissipat. *Vel* disjicit, spargit, in parvas guttas infringit.

[8] Exstillescant. *Sensus est*: Eodem pacto, quo sputum hoc digitis disjectum in minutas stillas resolutum est, oculi mei in minutas guttas stillasque disrupti disperdantur.

[9] Id dedecus castrorum. Impurum hunc militem, qui dedecori castris erat.

Sibi quisque metuit, et primi mussant Duces.[1]
Tamen is, Cinædus habitu, sed Mars viribus,
Adiit sedentem pro tribunali Ducem,
Et voce molli: Licet?[2] enim verò ejici,
Ut in re atroci,[3] Magnus stomachans imperat.
Tum quidam senior ex amicis Principis:
Hunc ego committi satiùs fortunæ arbitror,
In quo jactura levis est, quam fortem virum,
Qui casu victus, temeritatis te arguat.
Adsensit Magnus, et permisit Militi
Prodire contrà; qui, mirante exercitu,
Dicto celeriùs, hostis abscidit caput,
Victorque rediit. His tum Pompeius super:
Coronâ, Miles, equidem te dono libens,
Quia vindicâsti laudem Romani imperî;
Sed exstillescant oculi sic, inquit, mei,
(Turpe[4] illud reddens quod Cinædus fecerat)
Nisi tu abstulisti sarcinas furto meas.

FABULA XI.

Juno, Venus, et Gallina.

Cum castitatem Juno laudaret suam,
Jucunditatis causam[5] non repulit Venus;
Nullamque ut affirmaret esse illi parem,[6]
Interrogâsse sic Gallinam dicitur:
Dic sodes, quanto possis satiari cibo?
Respondit illa: Quidquid dederis satis erit;
Sed ut concedas pedibus aliquid scalpere.[7]
Ne scalpas, inquit, satis est modius tritici?

---

[1] Mussant Duces. Mussare est summissâ voce loqui, ne alii audiant, quod pudorem faciat.

[2] Licet? Perindè ac si dixisset: Licetne mihi in hostem prodire? cum Barbaro congredi?

[3] Ut in re atroci. Rem atrocem Romani appellabant, ex quâ Reipublicæ dedecus aliquod fieret. *Sallustius* ait: Itaque, quod plerumque in atroci negotio solet, Senatus decrevit.

[4] Turpe illud reddens. Imitans turpitudinem illam quam Miles fecerat.

[5] Jucunditatis causam. Arripuit Venus, non passa est præteriri. Quidam legunt: Jucunditatis causâ. Quod sic interpretandum est: Jocandi causâ, Venus Junonem non repulit, non confutavit.

[6] Parem. Junoni in castitate parem.

[7] Scalpere. Dicuntur Gallinæ scalpurire, ruspari, radere, scabere.

Planè, immò nimiùm est, sed permitte scalpere.
Ex toto ne quid scalpas,[1] quid desideras?
Tum denique illa fassa est naturæ malum:[2]
Licet horreum mihi pateat, ego scalpam tamen.
Risisse Juno dicitur Veneris joco,
Quia per Gallinam denotavit Feminas.

FABULA XII.

Paterfamilias et Æsopus.

PATERFAMILIAS sævum habebat filium:
Hic e conspectu patris cùm recesserat,
Verberibus servos adficiebat plurimis,
Et exercebat[3] fervidam adolescentiam;
Æsopus ergo narrat hoc breviter seni:
Quidam juvenco vetulum adjungebat bovem:
Is, cùm refugiens impari collo jugum,[4]
Ætatis excusaret vires languidas:
Non est quod timeas, inquit illi Rusticus;
Non ut labores[5] facio, sed ut istum domes,
Qui calce et cornu multos reddit debiles.
Sic tu, nisi natum tecum assiduè detines,
Sævumque ingenium comprimis clementiâ,
Vide ne querela[6] major accrescat domûs.
Atrocitati mansuetudo est remedium.

FABULA XIII.

Philosophus et Victor Gymnicus.

FORTE victorem Gymnici certaminis
Jactantiorem[7] quùm vidisset Philosophus,

---

[1] Ne quid scalpas. Ut omnino a scalpendo abstineas.
[2] Naturæ malum. *Id est*: Vitium a naturâ sibi inditum, malum naturale et necessarium.
[3] Et exercebat. *Id est*: sævis facinoribus ferventem ætatem suam exercebat.
[4] Refugiens impari collo jugum. *Id est*: Detrectans jugum, quod sibi cum juvenco ardente et violento, non cum alio bove viribus sibi pari ferendum erat.
[5] Non ut labores. *Id est*: Non id facio, ut te nimiùm duris laboribus exerceam, sed ut cogas istum juvencum nimis fervidum deponere feritatem, et lenitatem tuam usu assumere.
[6] Vide ne querela. *Id est*: Vide ne servi, qui hodie queruntur de filio tuo, majoribus deinceps injuriis et contumeliis adficiantur.
[7] Jactantiorem. *Id est*: Qui in suas laudes nimis gloriosè et immodicè se effunderet.

Interrogavit, an plus adversarius
Suus valuisset? Ille: Ne istud dixeris:[1]
Multò fuêre vires majores meæ.
Quod, inquit, ergo, stulte, meruisti decus,
Minùs valentem si vicisti fortior?
Ferendus esses fortè, si te diceres
Superâsse qui fuisset melior viribus.[2]

FABULA XIV.

Asinus ad Lyram.

Asinus jacentem vidit in prato Lyram:
Accessit, et tentavit chordas ungulâ.
Sonuêre tactæ. Bella res![3] me Hercules;
Malè cessit,[4] ait, artis quia sum nescius.
Si repperisset aliquis hanc prudentior,[5]
Divinis aures oblectâsset cantibus.
Sic sæpe[6] ingenia calamitate intercidunt.

FABULA XV.

Vidua et Miles.

Per aliquot annos quædam dilectum Virum
Amisit, et sarcophago[7] corpus condidit;
A quo divelli nullo cùm posset modo,
Et in sepulcro lugens vitam degeret,
Claram adsequuta est famam castæ Virginis.[8]
Intereà fanum qui compilârant Jovis,
Cruci affixi luerunt pœnas Numini;
Horum reliquias ne quis posset tollere,
Custodes dantur milites cadaverum,
Monumentum juxta Mulier quo se incluserat.

---

[1] Ne istud dixeris. *Id est*: Ne dicas, adversarium meum viribus, seu virtute et robore mihi præstitisse.

[2] Melior viribus. *Seu* Potior te, quoad vires.

[3] Bella res! Lyræ nempè jucundi et sciti soni.

[4] Malè cessit. *Id est*: Malum habuit exitum. Tangenti malè respondit.

[5] Prudentior. Peritior, doctior me in arte musicâ.

[6] Sic sæpe. Ut Lyræ cantus, sic hominum ingenia miserè pereunt. Iis occurrunt qui artem non nôrunt.

[7] Sarcophago. Sarcophagus propriè lapis dictus fuit qui carnes exederet, ex *σὰρξ*, *σαρκὸς*, græcè, *caro*, et *φάγω*, *comedo*.

[8] Virginis. Virgo dicebatur non ea tantùm quæ esset conjugii expers, sed nupta vel vidua, dummodò esset florenti ætate.

Aliquando sitiens unus de custodibus,
Aquam rogavit mediâ nocte Ancillulam,
Quæ fortè Dominæ tunc adsistebat suæ,
Dormitum eunti: namque lucubraverat,
Et usque in serum[1] vigilias perduxerat.
Paulùm reclusis foribus Miles prospicit,
Videtque ægram, sed facie pulchrâ, Feminam.
Corruptus animus illico succenditur,
Sensim impudicâ et uritur cupidine.
Solers acumen mille causas invenit
Per quas videre possit illam sæpius.
Hæc quotidianâ capta consuetudine,
Paulatim facta est ad votum submissior.[2]
Mox arctiore vinxit animum copulâ.
Hic dum consumit noctes Miles diligens,
Desideratum est[3] corpus ex unâ cruce.
Turbatus Miles factum exponit Mulieri;
At sancta Mulier; Non est quod timeas, ait,
Virique corpus tradit figendum cruci,
Ne subeat ille pœnas negligentiæ.
Sic turpitudo[4] laudis obsedit locum.

FABULA XVI.

Duo juvenes Proci, dives et pauper.

Fortuna interdum præter spem hominibus faveŧ.
Unà[5] expetebant Virginem Juvenes duo.
Vicit Locuples genus et formam Pauperis.
Ut nuptiarum dictus advenit dies,
Amans, dolorem quia non poterat perpeti,
Mœrens, propinquos contulit se in hortulos,
Quos ultra paulò,[6] villa splendida Divitis
Erat acceptura Virginem e matris sinu,

---

[1] Usque in serum. Usque in seram noctem.
[2] Ad votum submissior. *Id est:* Facilior, indulgentior, ad voluntatem Militis pronior, magis obtemperans ejus voto.
[3] Desideratum est. Non est inventum, ablatum fuit, detractum.
[4] Sic turpitudo. Sic honestatis famam adepta est Mulier infamis. Sic sepulcrum, quod antèa fuit locus pudicitiæ, factum est turpe.
[5] Unà. *Id est:* Eodem tempore.
[6] Quos ultra paulò. Paulò ultra quos hortulos.

Parum ampla,[1] in urbe, visa quod fuerat domus.
Pompa explicatur. Turba concurrit frequens,
Et conjugalem[2] præbet Hymenæus facem.
Asellus autem, qui solebat Pauperi
Quæstum referre, stabat portæ in limine:
Illum Puellæ casu conducunt suæ,
Viæ labores teneros ne lædant pedes.
Repentè cœlum, Veneris misericordiâ,[3]
Ventis movetur; intonat mundi fragor,
Noctemque densis horridam nimbis parat;
Lux rapitur oculis, et simul vis grandinis
Effusa trepidos pulsat, et omnes dissipat,
Sibi quemque cogens quærere præsidium fugâ.
Asellus notum proximum tectum subit,
Et voce magnâ sese venientem indicat.
Procurrunt pueri. Pulchram aspiciunt Virginem,
Et admirantur; deinde Domino nuntiant.
Inter sodales ille paucos adcubans,
Amorem crebris avocabat poculis.
Ubi nuntiatum est, recreatus gaudio,[4]
Hortante Baccho et Venere, dulces perficit,
Æqualitatis inter plausus, nuptias.
Quærunt Parentes per præconem Filiam.
Novus Maritus Conjuge amissâ dolet.
Quod esset actum, postquàm populo innotuit,
Omnes favorem[5] comprobârunt cœlitum.

FABULA XVII.

Æsopus et ejus Domina.

ÆSOPUS turpi cùm serviret feminæ,
Quæ se expingendo totum intricabat diem:[6]

---

[1] Parum ampla. Angustior ad pompam et turbam recipiendam visa.
[2] Et conjugalem. Hymenæo fax attribuebatur, et in nuptiis ad bonum omen præferebantur faces. Puer Hymenæi habitu incedebat.
[3] Veneris misericordiâ. *Intellige:* Erga Pauperem, qui, cùm amore deperiret, non poterat, ob inopiam, Virginem ducere.
[4] Recreatus gaudio, quod tam insperato casu, Virgo quam amabat, in manus suas pervenisset.
[5] Omnes favorem, etc. *Scilicet*: Probârunt quod cœlites fecerant. Placere cœlo nuptias declarârunt, et judicârunt ratas esse, legitimas.
[6] Totum intricabat diem. Intricare diem, significat in tricis diem exigere.

Vestem, uniones, aurum, argentum, comparans
Nec inveniebat digito, qui se tangeret.
Licetne paucis?[1] inquit. Dicas.[2] Censeo,[3]
Quid vis efficies, cultum si deposueris.
Adeòne per me videor tibi meliuscula?[4]
Imò, nisi dederis, sponda cessabit tua.[5]
At non cessabunt[6] latera, respondet, tua;
Et objurgari[7] jussit Servum garrulum.
Paulò post armillam tollit is argenteam:
Eam non apparere ut dictum est Mulieri,
Furore plena, vocat omnes, et verbera
Proponit gravia, verum si non dixerint.
Aliis minare, inquit; me non fallis quidem:[8]
Flagris sum cæsus, verum quia dixi modò.
Disce hinc quàm noceat sæpe verum dicere.

FABULA XVIII.

Gallus lecticâ vectus a Felibus, et Vulpes.

Feles habebat Gallus lecticarios.
Hunc gloriosè Vulpes ut vidit vehi,
Sic est locuta: Moneo, præcaveas dolum;
Istorum vultus namque si consideras,
Prædam portare[9] judices, non sarcinam.
Postquàm esurire cœpit serò[10] Societas,
Discerpsit Dominum, et fecit partes[11] facinoris.

---

[1] Licetne paucis? Æsopus a Dominâ, ut servum decet, veniam petit, ut eam alloquatur. Licetne paucis verbis præfari?

[2] Dicas. Domina facultatem loquendi tribuit.

[3] Censeo. Hìc Æsopus loquitur: Ut censeo, quosvis ad te pellicies, si cultum istum tuum abjeceris.

[4] Meliuscula. *Id est*: Pulchrior, venustior sine pretiosâ veste, absque auro et argento.

[5] Sponda cessabit tua. Hìc Æsopus ait: Lectus tuus vacabit, manebit vacuus, nisi quod in cultum impendis, amatoribus tuis largiaris.

[6] At non cessabunt, etc. Nempè a verberibus, ac flagris latera plectentur tua.

[7] Et objurgari, etc. Cædi verberibus.

[8] Me non fallis quidem. Quem cædis verberibus, quia verum dixi. Istæ igitur minæ apud me non valent ut veritatem dicam.

[9] Prædam portare. Judicabis Lecticarios istos non portare te ut sarcinam, sed ut prædam quam devorent, urgente fame.

[10] Serò. Instante horâ cœnæ.

[11] Et fecit partes. *Id est*: Gallum divisit in partes, et necati corporis partem unicuique dedit.

FABULA XIX.

Scrofa parturiens, et Lupus.

PREMENTE partu Scrofa cùm gemeret jacens,
Accurrit Lupus, et obstetricis partibus
Se posse fungi dixit, promittens opem.
Quæ verò nôsset pecoris fraudes improbi,
Suspectum officium repudiavit Malefici:
Et satis est,[1] inquit, si recedas longiùs.
Quod si perfidiæ se commisisset Lupi,
Pari dolore[2] fata deflêsset sua.

FABULA XX.

Servus profugus, et Æsopus.

MALO non esse disces addendum malum.
Servus profugiens Dominum naturæ asperæ,
Æsopo occurrit, notus e viciniâ.[3]
Quid tu confusus?[4] Dicam tibi clarè, Pater;
Hoc namque es dignus appellari nomine,
Tutò querela quia apud te deponitur;
Plagæ supersunt, desunt nunquam verbera.
Subindè ad villam[5] mittor servus rustico.
Domi si cœnat Dominus, persto noctibus;
Sive est vocatus, vigilo ad lucem in semitâ.
Emerui libertatem; canus servio.
Ullius essem culpæ si mihi conscius,
Æquo animo ferrem. Nunquam sum factus satur,[6]
Et sævum Dominum patior infelix super.
Has propter causas, et quas longum est promere,
Abire destinavi quò tulerint pedes.
Ergò, inquit, audi. Quùm mali nil feceris,
Hæc experiris, ut refers, incommoda.

---

[1] Et satis est. Satis insigne mihi officium præstabis, si a me recedas longiùs.

[2] Pari dolore. Pari cruciatu quo parturiens premebatur.

[3] Notus e viciniâ. Quem Æsopus noverat, quòd esset e viciniâ.

[4] Quid tu confusus? Quâ de causâ, ait Æsopus, sic perturbatus videris?

[5] Subindè ad villam. Mittor ad villam ad præstanda rustico homini vilissima officia, perindè ac si ejus mancipium essem.

[6] Nunquam sum factus satur. *Id est:* Nunquam satis mihi tribuitur cibi, ut famem expleam.

Quid si peccâris, quæ te passurum putas?
Tali consilio est a fugâ deterritus.

FABULA XXI.

Equus circensis in pistrinum venundatus.

Equum e quadrigâ multis palmis nobilem
Abegit quidam, et in pistrinum vendidit.
Productus ad bibendum[1] quùm foret a molis,
In circum æquales ire conspexit suos,
Ut grata ludis ederent certamina.
Lacrymis obortis: Vivite felices, ait;
Celebrate sine me cursu solemnem diem.
Ego quò scelesta furis attraxit[2] manus,
Ibi sorte tristi fata deflebo mea.
Ferendum æquo animo est quidquid acciderit mali.

FABULA XXII.

Ursus esuriens.

Si quando in sylvis Urso desunt copiæ,[3]
Scopulosum ad littus currit, et prendens petram[4]
Pilosa crura sensim demittit vado.
Quorum inter villos simùl hæserunt Canceres,
Intortam[5] adripiens excutit prædam manu,
Escâque fruitur passim collectâ Vafer.
Ergò etiam stultis acuit ingenium fames.

FABULA XXIII.

Viator et Corvus.

Quidam per agros devium carpens iter,
Ave exaudivit, et moratus paululùm,
Adesse ut vidit neminem, cepit gradum.[6]
Iterum salutat[7] idem ex occulto sonus.

---

[1] Productus ad bibendum. Eductus foras ut biberet.
[2] Attraxit. Vi abduxit.
[3] Desunt copiæ. Si non habeat quo vescatur cibo.
[4] Prendens petram. *Id est:* Complectens tanquam brachiis petram.
[5] Intortam pilo Ursino. Intorti capillis angues, ait *Virgilius.*
[6] Alii legunt *gradi.*
[7] Iterum salutat. Eadem vox iterat: Ave; ex occulto loco eosdem reddit sonos.

Voce hospitali[1] confirmatus restitit,
Ut, quisquis esset, par officium[2] reciperet.
Cùm circumspectans errore[3] hæsisset diu,
Et perdidisset tempus aliquod, illico
Ostendit sese Corvus, et supervolans
Ave usque ingessit.[4] Tum se lusum intelligens,
At malè tibi sit, inquit, ales pessime,
Qui festinantis sic detinuisti pedes.[5]

FABULA XXIV.

Pastor et Capella.

Pastor Capellæ cornu baculo fregerat;
Rogare cœpit ne se Domino proderet:
Quamvis indignè læsa, reticebo tamen;
Sed res clamabit[6] ipsa quid deliqueris.[7]

FABULA XXV.

Serpens et Lacerta.

Serpens Lacertam fortè adversam[8] prenderat;
Quam devorare patulâ cùm vellet gulâ,
Arripuit illa[9] prope jacentem surculum,
Et pertinaci morsu transversum tenens
Avidum solerti rictum frænavit morâ.[10]
Prædam dimisit ore serpens irritam.[11]

---

[1] Voce hospitali. Voce amicâ.
[2] Par officium. *Id est:* Parem salutationem.
[3] Cùm ex errore diu immotus mansisset.
[4] Ave usque ingessit. Ingeminavit salutationem.
[5] Detinuisti pedes. Moratus es festinantem, et ne conficerem iter, impediisti.
[6] Res clamabit. Fractum cornu te prodet, etsi taceam.
[7] Quid deliqueris. In quo peccaveris.
[8] Adversam. Prehensa fuit Lacerta adversa veniens Serpenti.
[9] Arripuit illa, etc. Nempè parvum surculum, parvam quamdam virgulam ore celeriter corripuit.
[10] Morâ. Mora hìc non est ipsa cunctatio, sed quæ res efficit, ut moremur.
[11] Irritam. Quâ frui et vesci non potuit. Quæ avidum et inhiantem frustrata est.

FABULA XXVI.

Cornix et Ovis.

Odiosa Cornix super Ovem consederat;
Quam dorso cùm tulisset invita et diu,
Id, inquit, si dentato fecisses Cani,
Pœnas dedisses. Illa contrà pessima:
Despicio inermes, eadem cedo fortibus;
Scio quem lacessam; cui dolosa blandiar:
Ideo senectam per tot annos prorogo.

FABULA XXVII.

Sequitur Fabula XXVII., *de Servo et Domino*, quam inficetam, et Phædro parum dignam nemo est qui non judicet. Notandum est repertum codicem quandoque noluisse se legi. Scilicèt non atramento exaratum, sed viridi herbarum succo, tempus edax obligurivit, ita evanidis passìm literis ac fugientibus, ut restitui omnino sensus non potuerit. Et periculum est ne doctus quilibet, dum sinceras lectiones indagare satagit, a genuino textu aberret, sicque non Phædri, sed suas fabulas in lucem emittat.

FABULA XXVIII.

Lepus et Bubulcus.

Quum Venatorem celeri pede fugeret Lepus,
Et a Bubulco visus veprem irreperet:[1]
Per Superos oro, perque spes omnes tuas,
Ne me indices, Bubulce; nihil unquam mali
Huic agro feci. Et rusticus: Ne timueris,
Latè securus. Jamque Venator sequens:
Quæso, Bubulce, nunquid huc venit Lepus?
Venit, sed abiit hàc ad lævam; et dexteram
Demonstrat nutu partem. Venator citus
Non intellexit, seque e conspectu abstulit.
Tunc sic Bubulcus: Ecquid est gratum tibi[2]
Quòd te celavi? Linguæ prorsus non nego[3]

---

[1] Veprem irreperet. Irrepere is in aliquem locum dicitur qui clam, latenter se in eum inducit.

[2] Ecquid est gratum tibi? Sumne benè de te meritus? Ecquid sumitur pro *an, nunquid, num.*

[3] Linguæ prorsus non nego, etc. Nimirum linguæ quæ me servavit, cùm oppositam partem Venatori indicâsset.

Habere atque agere maximas me gratias ;
Verùm oculis ut priveris opto perfidis. [1]
Multi infideles pectore, verbis benevoli.

FABULA XXIX.

Meretrix et Juvenis.

Cum blandiretur Juveni Meretrix perfida,
Et ille læsus multis sæpe injuriis,
Tamen præberet sese facilem Mulieri,
Sic infidelis : Plures muneribus licet
Contendant, ego te plurimi facio tamen.
Juvenis recordans quoties deceptus foret :
Lubenter, inquit, mea lux, [2] hanc vocem audio,
Non quòd fidelis, [3] sed quòd jucunda es mihi.

FABULA XXX.

Fiber.

Canes effugere cùm jam non possit Fiber,
(Græci loquaces quem dixerunt Castorem,
Et indiderunt bestiæ nomen Dei, [4]
Hi qui se jactant [5] de verborum copiâ)
Abripere morsu fertur testiculos sibi,
Quia propter illos [6] sentiat sese peti.
Divinâ fieri quod ratione non negem.
Venator namque simul invenit remedium, [7]
Omittit ipsum persequi, et vocat Canes.

---

[1] Perfidis. Qui datam mihi a te fidem fefellerunt, et nutu dexteram partem quâ latebat Lepus, indicabant.

[2] Mea lux. Nota blandientium formula.

[3] Non quòd fidelis. Non quòd sis mihi unicè dedita, sed quia mihi places. Jucundum id dicitur quod voluptatem affert, quod sensibus blanditur suaviter.

[4] Dei. Nempe Castoris qui Jovis et Ledæ filius, et Pollucis frater erat.

[5] Hi qui se jactant, etc., qui gloriantur quòd Græca lingua verbis abundet, uberrima sit dictionibus ad quævis exprimenda.

[6] Quia propter illos. *Id est :* Ad necem quæri, occidi a Venatoribus. Fibri redimunt se eâ parte corporis, propter quam maximè expetuntur, ait *Plinius*.

[7] Remedium. Eam scilicet Castorei corporis partem quam, ut periculum fugeret, projecit, et cujus maximus est in medicinâ usus.

Hoc si præstare possent homines, ut suo
Vellent carere, tuti posthàc viverent.
Haud quisquam insidias nudo faceret corpori.[1]

FABULA XXXI.

Sequitur Fabula *de Papilione et Vespâ*, quam judicavi ita obliteratam et tam miserè restitutam, ut illam prorsus omiserim.

FABULA XXXII.

Terraneola et Vulpes.

Avis quam dicunt Terraneolam rustici,
In terrâ nidum quia componit scilicet,
Fortè occucurrit improbæ Vulpeculæ.
Quâ visâ, pennis altiùs se sustulit.
Salve, inquit illa; cur me fugisti, obsecro,
Quasi non abundè sit mihi in prato cibi?
Grylli, Scarabei, Locustarum copia
Præstò est. Quid metuas, rogo? Te multùm diligo
Propter tam sanctos mores et vitam probam.
Respondit contra: Tu benè quidem prædicas;
Non socia sum propterea tibi, sed subvolo.
Quin sequeris prædam?[2] Etiam tibi committo meam.

---

[1] Nudo faceret corpori. Homini scilicet fortunis experti, bonis spoliato; nam quis nudum spoliat? Soli divites periculis obnoxii.

[2] Quin sequeris prædam? *Id est:* Cur prædam tuam non sequeris? Imò ego prædam meam tibi relinquo; curæ tuæ committo. Gryllis vescere.

DR. CROMBIE'S REMARKS

On the Notice of his "Gymnasium, sive Symbola Critica,

2 Vols. Oct. 1*l.* 1*s.*"

It is not my intention to protract a discussion, which may have already perhaps become uninteresting to some of your readers. But in justice to the Reviewer, as well as to myself, I deem it incumbent upon me to offer a few observations, in reply to his answer in No. XXVI. of the *Classical Journal.*

When I observed that the Oration *Pro Domo* carried with it sufficient evidence of good classical authority, I intended merely to signify, that it contains no word or phrase, no syntactical expression, as far as I have observed, which is not justified by Cicero himself, or writers of unquestionable reputation. Whether, or in what degree, it may have descended to us in a mutilated or interpolated state, I have not had sufficient leisure as yet to enquire. As I am not disposed to adhere pertinaciously to old opinions, so I am equally disinclined to renounce them without mature examination.

When I remarked, that *audax* is uniformly used in an unfavorable sense, I ought to have added, that such at least is the usage of Cicero. Farther enquiry leads me to doubt, whether Cæsar, Livy, or Sallust, ever employ it in a favorable sense. With poetical usage I have no concern.

I have said, that *alta vox* is a questionable expression, and it still appears to me in that light. Gesner has offered two hypotheses, in order to account for the origin of the expression. First, he conjectures that it took its rise, by analogical derivation, from the construction of the musical scale. *Vox alta*, says he, *a musicorum diagrammatis primum dicta;* and the expression *summa vox*, in the judgment of the learned Reviewer, seems in some degree to defend this opinion. From this explanation, as erroneous, I have already expressed my dissent; and I now repeat my persuasion, that Gesner's conjecture is wholly incorrect. The highest note in respect to place on the harp, as well as on the musical scale, was called *gravissima*, or the lowest in point of tone, and conversely. Baxter, as the Reviewer remarks, makes ὑπάτη equivalent to *gravissima*, and Acron, in his annotations on Horace, (Sat. 1. 2.) concurs with him. The words of Joannes Philoponus correspond to the modern mode of naming the strings, ἡ νεάτη (*novissima*) χορδὴ denoting the last or fourth string, the tone of which is acute, and ἡ ὑπάτη (*summa*) the first or uppermost string, the tone

of which is grave. "In the first Mercurian lyre," says Dr. Burney, "the longest string, which produced the lowest tone, from being placed higher on the instrument, as is the case in the modern harp, was called *ὑπάτη*, the highest string: and *Nete* for the same reason was afterwards, upon the extension of the scale, called lowest, though the most acute. For, says he, the adjective *ὕπατος summus* and *νήτος imus*, have manifestly been applied to sounds, more to express their situation on the lyre, than the length of the strings, or the graveness, or acuteness of their tones." To the same purpose are the words of Dr. Wallis. "The Greeks," says he, "called *hypate* 'supreme,'" though it is the lowest sound or string of the Tetrachord, and *nete* last or lowest, though the most acute; therefore, those, who made use of these names, applied them differently from us, calling grave *high*, and acute *low*. Suidas defines *ὑπάτη βαρὺν φθόγγον ἀποτελοῦσα*, and *νήτη sonum acutum edens*. Boethius likewise, in his Treatise on Music, places in all his diagrams low sounds at the top, and high ones at the bottom. Rousseau, in his Dictionary of Music, delivers the same opinion. But it would be endless to multiply authorities. There can exist, I conceive, no doubt, whatever, of the accuracy of the general opinion, which I formerly stated, that low tones were at the top of the harp, and also of the musical scale, and low ones at the bottom of each. Gesner therefore, in supposing that the expression *alta vox* might derive its origin from the ancient musical scale, is wholly in error.

That it may have been derived *a visu*, which is the other conjecture of Gesner, and which is adopted by the Reviewer, is possible, perhaps probable. But it is one thing to account for the origin of a word or phrase, and quite another thing to prove its consistency with good classic usage. The origin of a word or phrase it may be easy perhaps to ascertain; but it is not its origin, but its legitimacy, not its congruity with analogy of conception, but its employment by reputable writers, that determines its classic character. It is true, that as we find in Cicero the expression *vox altius attollitur*, reasoning from analogy we might be led to infer, that *alta vox* is a classical prose expression. But as I remarked in my former communication on this subject, it is not analogy, but the positive authority of classic usage that can justify the employment of any word or phrase. The expression *alta vox* occurs oftener than once, as Ol. Borrichius observes, in the dramatic compositions of Seneca: and also in Catullus, but as it is found, I believe, in no prose writer of either the Augustan or the succeeding age, I consider the expression as of too questionable a character to be admitted by any writer, who is ambitious of a prose style at once elegant and correct.

The Reviewer thinks me incautious in saying, that neither Cicero

nor Cæsar, Livy nor Sallust, ever employ the expression *alta voce*, but uniformly *magna voce*; and he quotes *summa voce* as used by Cicero. The learned Reviewer has here inadvertently committed a slight inaccuracy. *Summa vox* is not an expression precisely equivalent to *alta vox*. An attribute simply, and that attribute in the highest or lowest degree, are not one and the same; nor can terms, expressive of these different degrees, be considered as synonimous. *Summa voce* may be considered, as of the same import with *maxima voce*, or *quam maxima voce*, and Cicero employs these expressions indifferently: but *alta vox* cannot be considered as an expression, implying the same extension of voice, as *maxima* or *summa vox*. I repeat, therefore, that for *alta vox* these classic writers uniformly employ *magna vox*, as for *vox altissima* they use *summa* or *maxima*.

When I remarked, that the verb *adulari* may properly refer to the fawning of dogs, but that the mode of tracing its signification to this animal appears to me fanciful and unsatisfactory, I had no allusion whatever to the observations of the learned Reviewer; and I feel it my duty to express my regret that he should have misconceived my meaning. My remark referred particularly to the opinion of certain etymologists, who explain *adulari* as compounded of *ad οὐρὰν* (sc. *canum*), and that hence we have the verbs *adorare* and *adulari*. The explanation of the latter verb, as implying *ad aulam*, i. e. *ad ollam ire, vel ollam sectari, more iis blandientium, a quibus catillones esse sinuntur*, is more admissible, though still, as I conceive, unsatisfactory. Nonius refers the verb to the fawning of dogs, and in this opinion the ingenious Reviewer concurs.—This explanation, I candidly confess, now appears to me much more natural, as well as philosophical, than the derivation given by Valla and Scaliger, which I formerly adopted. Whatever may have been the etymon of this verb, I agree entirely with the Reviewer, that it strictly refers to the fawning of dogs, and shall in future prefer this explanation.

The Reviewer has, without any apparent necessity, expended much time, and adduced numerous examples for the purpose of proving the accuracy of that part of his definition of *sodalis*, respecting which there exists between us no difference of opinion. It is admitted that *sodalitates* or clubs were instituted for the purpose of celebrating the annual festivals of particular deities, and that these associations were originally composed of grave and virtuous men. It is agreed also, that they degenerated from their primitive character, and that many of them became seditious and factious meetings, aiming at the subversion of the state, assailing the reputation as well as the authority of private individuals, and practising all the arts of corruption at the public elections. It is evident also, that laws were enacted, by which these illicit and dangerous associations might be prevented. But, as I formerly

remarked, the casual act, or even the general conduct of any society is to be distinguished from the avowed and express purpose of its institution. I have perused the examples adduced by the ingenious critic, with all the attention of which I am capable, but they do not appear to me to justify the extended signification, which he has assigned to the word *sodalis*, as denoting a member of a club instituted for the benefit of an individual. The Reviewer lays great stress on the authority of Forcellinus. I respect the judgment of this learned and sagacious lexicographer; but in all such cases, I desire to see not opinions but arguments, not authority, but evidence. Forcellinus quotes the words of Cato; who informs us, that *sodalitates*, originally consisting of grave and good men, afterwards degenerated into confederacies against private individuals, and conspiracies against the state, and that the members, availing themselves of the opportunities, which their meetings afforded, formed plans for defeating the due administration of justice, for purchasing votes at an election, and subverting the established government. Hence these clubs were prohibited; and the term *sodalis* became a term of reproach. The passages quoted from Pliny, respecting the stated assemblies of Christians, which are there included under the general name of *Hetaeriæ*, can be scarcely said to touch the question. How the passage, cited by the Reviewer from *Justin* 20. 5. can prove, that *sodalis* means a member of a society formed for the benefit of an individual, it exceeds my powers of penetration to discover.[1] Yet the learned critic expresses his surprise at my want of faith in the accuracy of his definition, after his having produced this "important passage."

Forcellinus concludes with delivering it as his opinion, that the word *sodalitium* is applied to meetings held for the purpose of purchasing votes, and that those who favored any particular candidate, were in the practice of distributing money for the purposes of corruption, and compelling in some measure the people to vote for their favourite. But that these associations had for their object the benefit of the individual, rather than the promotion of their own factious views, through his means, appears to me to be a doubtful position. It would be too much to assert, that the Westminster Committee, for example, were associated for the benefit of their representatives, in parliament, it being more probable, that their chief object was to secure the election of two individuals whose political opinions accorded with theirs, and who, as they conceived, were by their principles and talents best qualified

[1] Sed trecenti ex juvenibus cum sodalitii jure sacramento quodam nexi, separatam a ceteris vitam exercuerunt, quasi cœtum clandestinæ conjurationis haberent, civitatem in se converterunt. *Just.* 20. 5.

to advocate their cause. In such cases the benefit of the candidate is less the object of pursuit, than the interest of the electors.

Be it granted, however, that these clubs were, in some instances, actuated by personal attachment to the individual, nay, that they were instituted to promote his political interest, still the learned critic appears to assign to the term too extensive a meaning, when he explains it as denoting a member of a club instituted for the benefit of an individual. Consistently with this explanation, the benefit may be either civil or political, moral or physical; and the measures adopted for promoting it may be either just or unjust, legal or illegal. Had the critic confined his construction to political objects, I should have been more inclined to concur with him: but his explanation appears to me to leave the term without due restriction, by not specifying the nature of the benefit, and of the means employed for its attainment.

The word *sodalis*, I conceive, may be explained as denoting *a companion in pleasure or amusement—a fellow of a college or fraternity—a member of a society instituted for sacred and also convivial purposes—sometimes, however, though not professedly, with political and seditious views.* See Cic. ad frat. ii. 3.—Augustin. ad XII tab. et de leg. in Clodia de colleg.—Ascon. in Cic. p. 137.—Suet. in J. Cæs.—Id. in Aug. Cæs. Sigon. de Ant. Jur. Civ. Rom.—Rittersh. in leg. XII tab.

The ingenious critic candidly acknowledges, that he assents to many of my observations, respecting the verb *nubere*. I am not quite satisfied with this partial assent; and therefore take the liberty to enquire, in which of my remarks he is not inclined to concur. I delivered it as my opinion, that Tertullian erred in applying *nubere* to a man, in the sense, in which he has used the term. The Reviewer seemed inclined to justify him, and quoted from Noltenius two or three passages in which the verb is applied to males. These examples I have proved to have no relation to the question. I have likewise explained the meaning of the verb in all those instances, in which it is applied to males; and shown that they furnish no apology whatever for the error of Tertullian. Is there any inaccuracy in the explanation? If there is, I shall esteem it a favor, if the learned critic will point it out.

He observed, that Imp. Antoninus used *ducere* for *nubere;* and at the same time remarked, that this employment of the verb was as justifiable, as Tertullian's use of *nubere* for *ducere*. My answer was, that neither might be excused, that both might be in error, and that solecism is not to be defended by solecism, nor impropriety by impropriety. Antoninus might be right in his use of *ducere*, and Tertullian wrong in his employment of *nubere*. And this I have shown to be, in fact, the case; for the term is sarcastically employed by Antoninus, to a woman, who had re-

nounced the modesty and delicacy of her sex; as *nubere* is in similar instances applied to a man. The use of *ducere*, as employed by Antoninus, furnishes no apology whatever for the error of Tertullian. Will the learned Reviewer permit me again to ask, to which of these remarks he is not inclined to assent. He confesses, that he had no intention to maintain, that modern writers of Latin "have sufficient authority in the examples, which he produced, on the very respectable authority of Noltenius, for applying *nubere* to a man." Here I would beg leave to offer two observations. First, I do not clearly understand what the Reviewer means, by "the very respectable authority of Noltenius." The authority of no Lexicographer, according to my conception of *authority*, can either increase, or diminish the intrinsic weight or evidence of any example, which he may produce. The weight of the example depends, not on the respectability of the Lexicographer, but on the character of the author, from whom it is taken. Whether I find the example in Cole's Dictionary, or Stephens's *Thesaurus*, is of no moment. The example speaks for itself. The authority of the Lexicographer, how respectable soever, can neither augment, nor impair its force. But, secondly, if the Reviewer had no intention to affirm, that the examples from Tertullian and others, warrant the application of *nubere*, to a man, I cannot easily perceive the purport of his remarks: for I have unequivocally and precisely expressed the same thing. The ingenious Reviewer replies, that his object was to show, that other writers in the age of Tertullian employed the verb in the same manner, and that he ought not to bear the whole blame, when he was adopting the Latinity of his own time. Be it so. This is no justification of the error. I have not insinuated, that Tertullian was the only writer, who misemployed the verb *nubere*; and it was the error itself, not those who committed it, that it was my duty to point out.—When the Reviewer observed, that Antoninus was as much justified in applying *ducere* to a woman, as Tertullian in applying *nubere* to a man, it appeared to me to imply a principle, utterly irreconcileable with the rules of just criticism. This principle, however, the learned Reviewer has very properly disclaimed.

These observations I submit to the consideration of the ingenious critic, whose sagacity I respect, and whose liberality I esteem. I should be unworthy of the thanks, which he has been pleased to return to me, at the conclusion of his answer, if I closed my reply without expressing my obligations to him for the candour and urbanity displayed in his critique, and the courtesy, with which he has received my remarks.

Greenwich, Jan. 1817. *ALEX. CROMBIE.*

LOCI QUIDAM LUCIANI EMENDATI ATQUE EXPLANATI

A JOANNE SEAGER, A. B.

BICKNOR: WALLICÆ, IN COMITATU MONUMETHIÆ, RECTORE.

PARS V.—[Continued from No. XXVII. p. 77.]

VER. HIST. lib. II. pag. 135. *τὸ δ' ἦν πέλαγος ἄβυσσον, ἀρίζοις δένδροις καταφυτευόμενον· εἰστήκει δὲ τὰ δένδρα ὅμως ἀκίνητα, ὀρθὰ, καθάπερ ἐπιπλέοντα.* Cumulo, *εἰστήκει δὲ τὰ δένδρα ὅμως ἀκίνητα, ὀρθὰ, καθάπερ* ΕΠΙ ΓΗΣ ΟΝΤΑ. vel potius ΚΑΙΠΕΡ *ἐπιπλέοντα.*

VERÆ HISTOR. lib. II. pag. 136. *Ἐπέστημεν χάσματι μεγάλῳ, ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος διεστῶτος γεγενημένῳ, καθάπερ ἐν τῇ γῇ πολλάκις ἐωρῶμεν ὑπὸ σεισμῶν γιγνόμενα διαχωρήματα. ἡ μὲν οὖν ναῦς, καθελόντων ἡμῶν τὰ ἱστία, ῥαδίως ἔστη, παρ' ὀλίγον ἐλθοῦσα κατενεχθῆναι.* Mihi quidem liquet scribendum, *ἡ μὲν οὖν ναῦς, καθελόντων ἡμῶν τὰ ἱστία,* ΒΡΑΔΕΩΣ *ἔστη, παρ' ὀλίγον ἐλθοῦσα κατενεχθῆναι.*

TYRANNICIDA. p. 144. *μάλιστα δὲ ἐκεῖνο ἐλύπει, τὸ εἰδέναι μακρὰν, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀΐδιον, τὴν δουλείαν ἐσομένην, καὶ ἐκ διαδοχῆς παραδοθησομένην τὴν πόλιν ἄλλοτε ἄλλῳ δεσπότῃ καὶ πονηρῷ κληρονόμημα γενησόμενον τὸν δῆμον.* Interponendum videtur *καί.—ἐκ διαδοχῆς παραδοθησομένην τὴν πόλιν,* ΚΑΙ *ἄλλοτε ἄλλῳ δεσπότῃ πονηρῷ κληρονόμημα γενησόμενον τὸν δῆμον.*

TYRANNICIDA. pag. 146. (pag. 789. D. ed. Salm.) Quum in arcem quidam, ut tyrannum occideret, ascendisset, tyranno ipso non invento, filium ejus confodit, et gladium in vulnere reliquit. Leto filii superveniens pater, eodem gladio se ipse confecit. Qui filium interfecerat, præmium tyrannicidii poscit, quasi consulto tyranni ipsius vitæ pepercisset, hujusmodi rationem reddens: *ἐνταῦθα τοίνυν* (filio occiso, scilicet) *πρὸς ἐμαυτὸν, ᾧ ἄνδρες δικασταὶ, τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐλογισάμην· πάντ' ἔχει μοι καλῶς, πάντα πέπρακται, πάντα κατώρθωται· τίνα ἂν ὁ περίλοιπος κολασθείη τρόπον; ἐμοῦ μὲν γὰρ ἀνάξιός ἐστιν καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς δεξιᾶς, καὶ μάλιστα ἐπ' ἔργῳ λαμπρῷ, καὶ νεανικῷ, καὶ γενναίῳ ἀνηρήμενος, καταισχύνων κἀκείνην τὴν σφαγήν· ἄξιον δέ τινα δεῖ ζημίαν δήμιον· ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὴν συμφοράν, μηδὲ τὴν αὐτὴν κερδαίνειν· ἰδέτω, κολασθήτω, παρακείμενον ἐχέτω τὸ ξίφος· τοῦτῳ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐντέλλομαι. Ταῦτα βουλευσάμενος, αὐτὸς μὲν ἐκποδὼν ἀπηλλαττόμην. ὁ δὲ, ὅπερ ἐγὼ προυμαντευσάμην, διεπράξατο, καὶ ἐτυραννοκτόνησε, καὶ τέλος ἐπέθηκε τῷ ἐμῷ δράματι.*—Lego; *ἄξιον δέ τινα δεῖ ζημίαν δήμιον· ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὴν συμφοράν,* (necem filii visam) ΜΗΔ' ΕΑΝ ΤΑΥΤΗΝ *κερδαίνειν.* (moriendo scilicet antequam vidisset.) *Κερδαίνειν* est *Devitare. κερδαίνει* supplicium is cui *condonatur.* Hanc emendationem firmissimam judico.

TYRANNICIDA. pag. 147. [791. C. ed. Salm.] *εἰ δὲ μόνος ἐγὼ πάντα διεπραξάμην, τολμῶν, κινδυνεύων, ἀνιῶν, ἀναιρῶν, κολάζων, δι' ἀλλήλων τιμωρούμενος, τί μου διαβάλλεις τὰ κατορθώματα; ἀνιῶν* redditum est a Gesnero *ascendendo.* Si hoc voluit Lucianus, reponendum est *ἀνιῶν.*

TYRANNICIDA. pag. 151. [p. 794. B. ed. Salm.] *τί γάρ καὶ οὐχὶ ἐξελάσας τις τύραννον ἤδη τιμὴν ἔλαβε τυραννοκτόνου*; Corrigendum videtur: *τί γάρ; οὐχὶ καὶ ἐξαλάσας τις τύραννον ἤδη τιμὴν ἔλαβε τυραννοκτόνου*;

TYRANNICIDA. pag. 152. [p. 796. A. ed. Salm.] *τὸ δὲ δὴ ἄχρι τῶν τυράννων προσελθεῖν οὐκ ἂν ὑπῆρξέ μοι, μὴ οὐχὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτοὺς φυλάκων καὶ δορυφόρων ἁπάντων κεκρατηκότι, κἀκείνους ἅπαντας προνενικηκότι.*—Malim *τὸ δὲ δὴ ἄχρι τῶν τυράννων* ΠΡΟΕΛΘΕΙΝ, &c. *Progredi, Procedere.*

TYRANNICIDA. p. 157. [p. 801. A. ed. Salm.] *ἰδὼν* (*ὁ τύραννος*) *τὸν υἱόν, ὃν εἶχε μόνον, ὀλίγον ἐμπνέοντα, ᾐμαγμένον, ἐμπεπλησμένον τοῦ φόνου, καὶ τὰ τραύματα συνεχῆ καὶ πολλὰ καὶ καίρια, ἀνεβόησε τοῦτο,—τέκνον, ἀνῃρήμεθα, πεφονεύμεθα, τετυραννοκτονήμεθα· ποῦ ὁ σφαγεύς; τίνι με τηρεῖ; τίνι με φυλάττει, διὰ σοῦ, τέκνον, προανῃρημένον; ἢ μή τι ὡς γέροντος ὑπερφρονεῖ; καὶ τῇ βραδυτῆτι κολάζειν δέον, καὶ παρατείνει μοι τὸν φόνον, καὶ μακροτέραν μοι τὴν σφαγὴν ποιεῖ.* Rectius legamus, *ἢ μή τι, ὡς γέροντος, ὑπερφρονεῖ*; *καὶ* (*κολάζειν δέον*) (*cum debeat, cum mihi optandum sit, supplicium meum repræsentari*) *παρατείνει μοι τὸν φόνον, καὶ μακροτέραν μοι τὴν σφαγὴν ποιεῖ*;

ABDICATUS. pag. 166. (p. 812. B. ed. Salm.) *ἀλλ' ὥσπερ τοῖς πατράσι τὰ τηλικαῦτα ὀργίζεσθαι ἐφῆκεν,* (*ὁ νομοθέτης*) *οὕτω καὶ τῶν παίδων προυνόησεν, ὡς μὴ ἀδίκως αὐτὸ πάσχωσι. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐλευθέραν ἔφη γίγνεσθαι, οὐδ' ἄκριτον, τὴν τιμωρίαν, ἀλλ' εἰς δικαστήριον ἐκάλεσε, καὶ δοκιμαστὰς ἐκάθισε τοὺς μήτε πρὸς ὀργὴν μήτε διαβολὴν τὸ δίκαιον κρινοῦντας.* Malim *καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐλευθέραν* ΕΦΗΚΕ *γίγνεσθαι οὐδ' ἄκριτον τὴν τιμωρίαν*—

ABDICATUS. p. 166. (p. 812. D. ed. Salm.) *οὔκουν ἠγεῖτο ἀδίκαστον γίγνεσθαι τὸ πρᾶγμα, οὐδ' ἐξ ἐρήμης τοὺς παῖδας εὐθὺς ἀλίσκεσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὕδωρ ἐγχεῖται, καὶ λόγος ἀποδίδοται, καὶ ἀνεξέταστον οὐδὲν καταλείπεται.* Legendum puto *Οὔκουν* ΗΦΙΕΤΟ *ἀδίκαστον γίγνεσθαι τὸ πρᾶγμα. Permisit, Concessit.*

ABDICATUS. p. 167. (813. B. ed. Salm.) *Ἐξετάσατε* (judicibus inquit filius, qui, cum abdicatus fuisset, et denuo pro meritis erga patrem, quem morbo liberaverat, in familiam ejus receptus, nunc iterum injuste abdicatur) *ἐξετάσατε εἰ ἔτι δοτέον ἀποκηρύττειν αὐτῷ, ἅπαξ ἀποκηρύξαντι, χρησαμένῳ τῇ παρὰ τοῦ νόμου ἐξουσίᾳ, καὶ ἀποπληρώσαντι τὴν πατρικὴν ταυτην δυναστείαν, εἶτ' αὖθις ἀναλαβόντι, καὶ λύσαντι τὴν ἀποκήρυξιν. ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ ἀδικώτατον εἶναί φημι τὸ τοιοῦτον, ἀπεράντους γενέσθαι καὶ τῶν παίδων τὰς τιμωρίας, καὶ πολλὰς τὰς καταδίκας, καὶ τὸν φόβον ἄδιον, καὶ τὸν νόμον ἄρτι μὲν συνοργίζεσθαι, μετὰ μικρὸν δὲ λύεσθαι, καὶ πάλιν ὁμοίως ἰσχυρὸν εἶναι.* Omnino sententia postulat, *ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ ἀδικώτατον εἶναί φημι τὸ τοιοῦτον, ἀπεράντους γενέσθαι* ΚΑΤΑ *τῶν παίδων τὰς τιμωρίας.*

ABDICATUS. p. 169. (816. A. ed. Salm.) *ἀμεταμόητον οὖν τὴν ἀνάληψιν, καὶ τὴν διαλλαγὴν βέβαιαν εἶναι προσῆκει, μετὰ κρίσιν οὕτω πολλὴν καὶ δύο δικαστήρια· ἓν μὲν τὸ πρῶτον, ἐφ' οὗ παρῃτήσω, δεύτερον δὲ τὸ σὸν, ὅτε μετεβουλεύσω, καὶ ἀνάδαστον ἐποίησας· τὰ πρότερον ἐγνωσμένα λύσας, βεβαιοῖς τὰ μετ' ἐκεῖνα βεβουλευμένα.* Scribendum fortasse—*δύο δικαστήρια· ἓν μὲν τὸ πρῶτον, ἐφ' οὗ παρῃτήσω, δεύ-*

τερον δὲ τὸ σὸν, ὅτε μετεβουλεύσω, καὶ ΤΟ ΠΡΩΤΟΝ (*δικαστήριον* scilicet) *ἀνέδασσον ἐποίησας· τὰ* ΜΕΝ *πρότερον ἐγγωσμένα λύσας,* ΒΕΒΑΙΩΣΑΣ ΔΕ *τὰ μετ' ἐκεῖνα βεβουλευμένα.*

ABDICATUS. pag. 171. (pag. 817. E. ed. Salm.) *Οὔ τί γένοιτ' ἂν ἀχαριστότερον ; σωθέντα* (patrem meum) *δι' ἐμὲ, καὶ τηλικοῦτον κίνδυνον* (morbi scilicet, quem curavi) *διαπεφευγότα, τοῖς τοιούτοις* (altera abdicatione puta) *εὐθὺς ἀμείβεσθαι, τῆς θεραπείας ἐκείνης οὐδ' ἕνα λόγον ἔχοντα, ἀλλ' οὕτω ῥᾳδίως ἐπιλελῆσθαι, καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐρημίαν ἐλαύνειν τὸν ἐφησθέντ' ἂν δικαίως, ἐφ' οἷς ἀδίκως ἐξεβέβλητο, μὴ μόνον δ' οὐ μνησικακήσαντα, ἀλλὰ καὶ σώσαντα καὶ σωφρονεῖν παρασκευάσαντα ;* Gesnerum, virum tam doctum, tam perspicacem, *τὸ μνησθέντ'* pro *τῷ ἐφησθέντ'* mutari voluisse, vehementer miror. Post *ἐφησθέντ' ἂν* subaudi *τῷ νόσῳ, τῇ συμφορᾷ*, vel tale quid. *τὸν ἐφησθέντ' ἂν δικαίως, ἐφ' οἷς ἀδίκως ἐξεβέβλητο* est "*eum, qui patris calamitate, morbo, jure lætari potuisset, propterea quod abdicatus inique fuerat.*"

ABDICATUS. pag. 173. [p. 820. A. ed. Salm.] *ὃν ἔσωσα, καὶ ὃς τοῦ βίου πάντος χρεώστης ἐστί μοι, καὶ ᾧ τὸ εἶναι, καὶ τὸ σωφρονεῖν, καὶ τὸ συνιέναι παρέσχημαι· καὶ μάλιστα, ὅτε οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες ἤδη ἀπεγνώκεσαν, καὶ ἤπτους εἶναι ὠμολόγουν τῆς νόσου. τοῦτο γὰρ μεῖζον οἶμαι ποιεῖν τὴν ἐμὴν εὐεργεσίαν, ὡς οὔτε υἱὸς ὢν τότε, ἀναγκαίαν τῆς θεραπείας ἔχων αἰτίαν, ἀλλ' ἐλεύθερος καθεστὼς, καὶ ἀλλότριος, τῆς φυσικῆς αἰτίας ἀφειμένος, ὅμως οὐ περιεῖδον, ἀλλ' ἐθελοντὴς, ἄκλητος, αὐτεπάγγελτος, ἦκον, ἐβοήθησα, προσελιπάρησα, ἰασάμην*—Melius *τοῦτο γὰρ μεῖζον οἶμαι ποιεῖν τὴν ἐμὴν εὐεργεσίαν,* ΄ΟΣ, *οὔτε υἱὸς ὢν τότε, ἀναγκαίαν τῆς θεραπείας ἔχων αἰτίαν ἀλλ' ἐλεύθερος καθεστὼς—ἰασάμην.*

ABDICATUS. p. 177. [825. A. ed. Salm.] *Οὐδὲ τοῦθ' ὁ νομοθέτης φησὶν, ὅ τι ἂν τύχῃ ὁ πατὴρ αἰτιασάμενος, ἀποκηρυττέτω, καὶ ἀπόχρη θελῆσαι μόνον καὶ μέμψασθαι· τί γὰρ ἂν ἔδει δικαστηρίου ; ἀλλ' ὑμᾶς ποιεῖ τοῦτο, ὦ ἄνδρες δικασταὶ, σκοπεῖν, εἴτ' ἐπὶ μεγάλοις καὶ δικαίοις ὁ πατὴρ ὀργίζεται, εἴτε καὶ μή· ὑμῖν* pro *ὑμᾶς* habet editio Florentina : scribo igitur *ἀλλ' ΕΦ' ὑμῖν ποιεῖ τοῦτο, ὦ ἄνδρες δικασταὶ, σκοπεῖν, εἴτ'*—

ABDICATUS. p. 178. [826. A. ed. Salm.] *οὐ πάντα προστάττειν νῦτε τούτῳ* (patri) *διδωσιν ὁ νόμος, οὔτ' ἐμοὶ τὸ πείθεσθαι πᾶσι πάντως ἀναγκαῖον· ἐν δ' οἷς τοῖς τῶν προσταγμάτων, τὰ μὲν ἀνεύθυνά ἐστι, τὰ δ' ὀργῆς καὶ τιμωρίας ἄξια.* Pro *ἐν δ' οἷν τοῖς* legendum censeo *ἐστὶ δ' οὕτως.*—*Οὔτ' ἐμοὶ τὸ πείθεσθαι πᾶσι πάντως ἀναγκαῖον.* ΕΣΤΙ Δ' ΟΥΤΩΣ· *τῶν προσταγμάτων τὰ μὲν ἀνεύθυνά ἐστι, τὰ δ' ὀργῆς καὶ τιμωρίας ἄξια.*

ABDICATUS. p. 180. [p. 828. C. ed. Salm.] *ταύτην ἐγὼ τὴν τέχνην* (medicinam) *οὐχ υἱὸς ὢν σὸς ἐξέμαθον, οὐδὲ τῷ σῷ νόμῳ ὑποκείμενος· καὶ ὅμως αὐτὴν μεμάθηκά σοι, καὶ πρῶτος αὐτῆς ἀπολέλαυκας, οὐδὲν παρὰ σοῦ πρὸς τὸ μαθεῖν ἔχων.* Locus injuria suspectus. Gesnerus legit *καὶ πρῶτος αὐτῆς ἀπολέλαυκας· οὐδὲν παρὰ σοῦ πρὸς τὸ μαθεῖν ἔχω.* Mutatione nihil opus. Verba (*καὶ πρῶτος αὐτῆς ἀπολέλαυκας*) parentheseos signis includenda sunt.

PHALARIS I. p. 189. [p. 838. E. ed. Salm.] *φιλανθρωπίᾳ γὰρ, καὶ πραότητι, καὶ τῷ ἡμέρῳ, καὶ ἰσοτιμίας, θαυμασίως ἐγὼ ἤλπιζον ἐς τὸ πείθεσθαι προσάξεσθαι τούτους.* Forte—*καὶ τῷ ἡμέρῳ, καὶ ἰσοτιμίᾳ*—κ. τ. λ.

PHALARIS. I. p. 196. [p. 844. A. ed. Salm.] *τὸν γὰρ ἅπαξ εἰς τὰ τοιαῦτα ἡμπεσεῖν ἠναγκασμένον ὅμοιον χρὴ τῇ ὑποθέσει καὶ αὐτὸν εἶναι, ἢ φειδόμενον τῶν πλησίον, ἀπολωλέναι.* Legere velim *ὅμοιον χρὴ τῇ ὑποθέσει, καὶ* TON *αὐτὸν, εἶναι,* vel *ὅμοιον χρὴ τῇ ὑποθέσει εἶναι, ἢ αὐτὸν, φειδόμενον τῶν πλησίον, ἀπολωλέναι.*

PHALARIS. I. p. 196. (845. A. ed. Salm.) *Εἰ δέ τις φαίη, βούλει, ὦ Φάλαρι, αὐτὸς τεθνάναι ἀδίκως, ἢ δικαίως κολάζειν τοὺς ἐπιβούλους, τοῦτο βουλοίμην ἂν· ὧδε γὰρ ὑμᾶς, ὦ Δελφοὶ, συμβούλους καλῶ, πότερον ἄμεινον εἶναι ἄδικως ἀποθανεῖν, ἢ ἄδικως σώζειν τὸν ἐπιβεβουλευκότα.* Sententia postulare videtur *ἄδικως ἀποθανεῖν, ἢ* ΕΝΔΙΚΩΣ ΚΟΛΑΖΕΙΝ *τὸν ἐπιβεβουλευκότα.*

PHALARIS. II. p. 202. [851. E. ed. Salm.] *Ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν* (Phalaris) *καὶ τὸ ἐνδοιάσαι ὑμᾶς ὅλως περὶ τούτου, καὶ δημιουργοὺς ἡμῖν προθεῖναι τὴν διάσκεψιν, εἰ χρὴ δέχεσθαι τὸ ἀνάθημα* (quod Apollini destinari) *ἢ ὀπίσω αὖθις ἀποπέμπειν, ἀνόσιον ἤδη εἶναι νομίζω· μᾶλλον δὲ οὐδ' ὑπερβολὴν ἀσεβείας ἀπολελοιπέναι· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀλλ' ἢ ἱεροσυλία τὸ πρᾶγμά ἐστι, μακρῷ τῶν ἄλλων χαλεπωτέρα· καὶ ὅσῳ τοῦ τὰ ἤδη ἀνατεθέντα συλᾶν τὸ μηδὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῖς ἀνατιθέναι βουλομένοις ἐπιτρέπειν ἀσεβέστερον.* Salmuriensis habet *καὶ ὅσον,* unde extrico *οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀλλ' ἢ ἱεροσυλία τὸ πρᾶγμά ἐστι· μακρῷ τῶν ἄλλων χαλεπωτέρα* ΚΑΘ' ''ΟΣΟΝ *τοῦ τὰ ἤδη ἀνατεθέντα συλᾶν τὸ μηδὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῖς ἀνατιθέναι βουλομένοις ἐπιτρέπειν ἀσεβέστερον.*

PSEUDOMANTIS. p. 217. [866. B. ed. Salm.] *κατορύττουσι δέλτους χαλκᾶς, λεγούσας, ὡς αὐτίκα μάλα ὁ Ἀσκληπιὸς σὺν τῷ πατρὶ Ἀπόλλωνι μέτεισιν εἰς τὸν πόντον, καὶ καθέξει τὸ τοῦ Ἀβώνου τεῖχος.* An *ὡς αὐτίκα μάλα ὁ Ἀσκληπιὸς σὺν τῷ πατρὶ Ἀπόλλωνι* ΚΑΤΕΙΣΙΝ *εἰς τὸν Πόντον*; Quanquam *μετεῖναι εἰς Πόντον* significare potest *Adesse in Ponto.*

PSEUDOMANTIS. p. 230. *μάλιστα δὲ ἡδοκίμουν παρ' αὐτῷ αἱ κυτμίδες, ἀκόπου τι ὄνομα πεπλασμένον, ἐκ λίπους αἰγείου* (Salmur. *ἀρκείου*) *συντεθειμένον.* Quid istuc verbi est? nomen ex adipe caprino compositum? Repone ΣΥΝΤΕΘΕΙΜΕΝΟΥ; et refer ad *ἀκόπου.*

PSEUDOMANTIS. p. 232. *δρόμος οὖν καὶ ὠθισμὸς ἀπανταχόθεν ἐγίγνετο, καὶ θυσίαι, καὶ ἀναθήματα, καὶ διπλάσια τῷ προφήτῃ, καὶ μαθητῇ τοῦ θεοῦ·* si post *ἀναθήματα* non subaudiatur *τῷ θεῷ,* delendum *καὶ,* ut *ἀναθήματα* et *διπλάσια* cohæreant.

PSEUDOMANTIS. p. 235. [881. ed. Salm.] *ἐπειδὴ πεισθεὶς ὁ ἠλίθιος ἐκεῖνος Κελτὸς εἰσέβαλε, καὶ ἀπήλλαξεν, αὐτῇ στρατείᾳ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ὀθρυάδου κατακοπεὶς, τοῦτον μὲν τὸν χρησμὸν ἐξαιρεῖ ἐκ τῶν ὑπομνημάτων, ἐντίθησι δ' ἄλλον ἀντ' αὐτοῦ.* Suppeditandum *κακῶς.*—*καὶ* ΚΑΚΩΣ *ἀπήλλαξεν, αὐτῇ στρατιᾷ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ὀθρυάδου κατακοπείς.*

PSEUDOMANTIS. p. 252. [894. Salm.] *εἰ δέ τινι, προσκαλουμένων κατὰ τάξιν τῶν χρησμῶν, (πρὸ μιᾶς δὲ τοῦτο τοῦ θεσπίζειν ἐγίγνετο) καὶ ἐρομένου τοῦ κήρυκος, εἰ θεσπίζοι; τῷ δὲ ἀνεῖπεν ἔνδοθεν· ἐς κόρακας, οὐκ ἔτι τὸν τοιοῦτον οὔτε στέγη τις ἐδέχετο, οὔτε πυρὸς ἢ ὕδατος ἐκοινώνει, ἀλλ' ἔδει γῆν πρὸ γῆς ἐλαύνεσθαι, ὡς ἀσεβῆ, καὶ ἄθεον, καὶ ἐπικούρειον, ἥπερ ἦν ἡ μεγίστη λοιδορία.* Distinguo *εἰ δέ τινι,*—— *ἐρομένου τοῦ κήρυκος, εἰ θεσπίζοι τῷδε, (velletne huic oraculum reddere) ἀνεῖπεν ἔνδοθεν "ἐς*

κόρακας," *οὐκ ἔτι τὸν τοιοῦτον οὔτε στέγη τις ἐδέχετο*—κ. τ. λ. Ita *ἀνεῖπεν* recte redit ad *τινί*.

PSEUDOMANTIS. p. 258. [899. Salm.] Lucianus, quo Alexandri pseudoprophetæ fraudes et fallacias convinceret, lepido commento usus est; quod sic narrat: *πάλαι ἐμοῦ ἐρομένου ἐν δύο βιβλίοις διαφόροις τὴν αὐτὴν ἐρώτησιν, πόθεν ἦν Ὅμηρος ὁ ποιητὴς, ἐπ' ἄλλου καὶ ἄλλου ὀνόματος, τῷ ἑτέρῳ μὲν ὑπέγραψεν, ἐξαπατηθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐμοῦ νεανίσκου, (ἐρωτηθεὶς γὰρ ἐφ' ὅ, τι ἥκε, θεραπείαν ἔφη αἰτήσων πρὸς ὀδύνην πλευροῦ) Κυπρίδι σε χρῆσθαι κέλομαι, δροσίην τέ κε Λητοῦς. Τῷ δὲ ἑτέρῳ, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τοῦτο ἠκηκόει, ὡς ἐρομένου τοῦ πέμψαντος, εἴτε μοι πλεῦσαι ἐπ' Ἰταλίαν, εἴτε πεζοπορῆσαι λῷον, ἀπεκρίνατο οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν Ὅμηρον, Μὴ σύ γε πλωίμεναι, πεζὴν δὲ καθ' οἶμον ὄδευε.* Repono Τῷ δὲ ἑτέρῳ, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ΤΟΥΤΟΥ (*τοῦ βιβλιωφόρου* scilicet) *ἠκηκόει, ὡς ἐρομένου τοῦ πέμψαντος εἴτε* ΟΙ (*τῷ πέμψαντι* puta) *πλεῦσαι ἐπ' Ἰταλίαν, εἴτε πεζοπορῆσαι λῷον. ἀπεκρίνατο κ. τ. λ.*

PSEUDOMANTIS. p. 260. *εἶτα δή μου ἐκπλεῖν προαιρουμένου, ξένια καὶ δῶρα πολλὰ πέμψας,*——*ὑπισχνεῖται καὶ πλοῖον αὐτὸς παρέξειν*——Malim, *εἶτα δ' ἐμοῦ ἐκπλεῖν προαιρουμένου.*

DE SALTATIONE. p. 266. [908. ed. Salm.] *ἀνὴρ δέ τις ὤν, ὦ λῷστε, καὶ ταῦτα παιδείᾳ σύντροφος, καὶ φιλοσοφίᾳ τὰ μέτρια ὁμιληκὼς ἀφέμενος, ὦ Ἀνκῖνε, τοῦ περὶ τὰ βελτίω σπουδάζειν, καὶ τοῖς παλαιοῖς συνεῖναι, κάθησαι καταυλούμενος, θηλυδρίαν ἄνθρωπον ὁρῶν, ἐσθῆσι μαλακαῖς, καὶ ἄσμασιν ἀκολάστοις ἐναβρυνόμενον, καὶ μιμούμενον ἐρωτικὰ γύναια τῶν πάλαι, τὰς μαχλοτάτας Φαίδρας, καὶ Παρθενόπας, καὶ Ῥοδόπας τινάς, καὶ ταῦτα πάντα ὑπὸ κρούμασι, καὶ τερετίσμασι καὶ ποδῶν κτύπῳ, καταγέλαστα ὡς ἀληθῶς πράγματα, καὶ ἥκιστα ἐλευθέρῳ ἀνδρὶ, καὶ οἵῳ σοὶ, πρέποντα*; Legendum puto ΚΑΘΗΤΑΙ *καταυλούμενος*—— Nominativus est *ἀνήρ*.

DE SALTATIONE. p. 279. [920. ed. Salm.] *Δοκεῖ γάρ μοι ὁ παλαιὸς μῦθος καὶ Πρωτέα, τὸν Αἰγύπτιον, οὐκ ἄλλο τι ἢ ὀρχηστήν τινα γενέσθαι λέγειν, μιμητικὸν ἄνθρωπον, καὶ πρὸς πάντα σχηματίζεσθαι καὶ μεταβάλλεσθαι δυνάμενον.*——*ὅπερ δὴ καὶ τοῖς νῦν ὀρχουμένοις πρόσεστιν. ἴδοις τ' ἂν οὖν αὐτοὺς πρὸς τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν ὡκέως διαλλαττομένους, καὶ αὐτὸν μιμουμένους τὸν Πρωτέα.* Repono *ἴδοις τ' ἂν οὖν αὐτοὺς πρὸς τὸν* ΑΥΤΩΝ *καιρὸν* (*prout tempora, occasiones, ab illis postulant*) *ὡκέως διαλλαττομένους.*

DE SALTATIONE. p. 286. [925. ed. Salm.] *πάλαι μὲν γὰρ αὐτοὶ καὶ ἤδον καὶ ὠρχοῦντο· εἶτ', ἐπειδὴ κινουμένων τὸ ἄσθμα τὴν ᾠδὴν ἐπετάρυττεν, ἄμεινον ἔδοξεν ἄλλους αὐτοῖς ὑπᾴδειν.* Inserendus articulus: *πάλαι μὲν γὰρ* ΟΙ *αὐτοὶ καὶ ἤδον καὶ ὠρχοῦντο.*

DE SALTATIONE. p. 292. [931. ed. Salm.] *ἐξῆς δὲ Μέγαρα, καὶ Νῖσος, καὶ Σκύλλα, καὶ πορφυροῦς πλόκαμος, καὶ Μίνωος πόρος, καὶ περὶ τὴν εὐεργέτιν ἀχαριστία.*—Græv. *Μίνωος πόθος* legit. Cogitabam olim *Μίνωος* ΦΟΡΟΣ, *Juvenum tributum, Minotauro objiciendorum*: nunc magis placet *Μίνωος* ΣΤΟΛΟΣ, *Expeditio adversus Megarenses et Athenienses.*

NOTICE OF

Sir Wm. Gell's *Itinerary of the Morea.*

We have much pleasure in announcing the publication of "an Itinerary of the Morea, being a description of the Routes in that Peninsula, by Sir William Gell, M. A. F. R. S. F. A. S."—This work, which comprises a very neat map of the routes in the Morea, must prove an acceptable and highly useful companion to all who visit that interesting part of Greece—and its convenient size, which adapts it to the pocket, (being a duodecimo volume of about 260 pages) will be considered probably as no trifling recommendation. "It has been asserted," says the ingenious author, (Preface p. x.) "that we are now so well acquainted with Greece, that an apology is required for any work on that country. This might be true, if any one of the critics who have enjoyed this imaginary triumph over those who have travelled in Greece, had even heard the names of the towns and villages of the Morea. Our sailors may have seen about seven towns on the coast; while with regard to the situation of ancient cities, our best scholars would be puzzled to point out the sites of Psophis, Methydrium, or Orchomenos, or even Mantinea and Tegea. It is the entire ignorance of this country which has tempted people to assert that they were thoroughly acquainted with it. The gentleman to whom this essay is inscribed, with all the advantages he possesses of talent and research, is fully sensible of the deficiency of the materials necessary to compile a map of the country."—Sir William Gell has dedicated this volume to Mons. Barbier-du-Bocage, one of the most celebrated geographers not only of France but of Europe.

As a specimen (taken at random) of the manner in which Sir William directs travellers, and indicates the objects most worthy of their notice, we shall extract (from page 123) the route from

Tripotamia to Strezoba.

Hours.	Minutes.	
..	25	Mopeki, a village on the hill l. (left.)
..	15	Vestiges l. This road seems that of Pausanias through the Soronian wood in his way to Psophis.
..	10	Versiki l. 3 miles. Beautiful valley.
..	10	Vestiges of antiquity. Fine scenery and woods.
..	10	Village Dachouni r. (right) and source of the river at the Khan of Tripotamia—a source of errors to geographers, who have made the river too long.

Hours.	Minutes.	
..	13	L. vestiges; and great source r.
..	9	Village Scupi l. on a rock.
..	8	Church and marbles. The valley opens on l.
..	5	Cross a river joining the Ladon in another direction. Here is a mistake in D'Anville's maps and all others. Palaio Kastro and great source l. This fortress has very curious remains of masonry, and it seems possible that it may be the PAOS of Pausanias. The source is very copious and beautiful.
..	11	St. Anastasio village r. on a hill. There is a village called Nasos in this vicinity.
..	22	Valley widens to a plain.
..	48	Vestiges. Fine woods.
..	12	Strezzoba, a large village, beyond which a fine view towards the Ladon.
3	18	

Sir William Gell has not omitted any opportunity of suggesting to the inquisitive antiquary or geographer, whatever seems capable of rewarding their researches—in which even the hint of an ancient name or position will often prove most serviceable—thus (p. 41.) "Village and orange trees—Strobitzi or Strovitzi. From the village there is a very steep ascent, once strongly fortified to a flat summit or table-hill. A curious gate remains, probably *Lepreon* or *Lepreum*. From the fortress, Paulitza is seen, and Mount Tetrage: also the valley of the Neda. On the north-east is Mofkitza, where is a palaiokastro, possibly MACISTUS."

Thus has he, who so ably illustrated by former works the antiquities and topography of Troy, of Ithaca, and of Argolis, condescended to direct the steps of travellers in the Morea—and we understand that the publishers of this little Itinerary (Messrs. Rodwell and Martin) will shortly offer to the world Sir William Gell's and Mr. Gandy's beautiful designs and descriptions of several interesting monuments lately discovered among the ruins of Pompeii.

SAPPHO EMENDATA.

Fragm. LIX. Volgeri. QUOD apud Schol. Sophocl. Electr. 147. adhuc servatur Sapphus fragmentum, sic omnino sine dubio est legendum: "Ἱρος ἄγγελ', ἰμερόφων' ἀηδοΐ.[1] Versus est, vulgo appel-

[1] Dr. Bentley so corrects the verse. See *R. Walpole's Translations*, p. 87, and the Notice of the *Mus. Crit.* in the *Brit. Crit. for Nov.* 1813, p. 490. ED.

latus, Sapphicus, ab initio, ut videtur, cantiunculæ, de luscinià agentis, desumtus; quod prætermisit Blomfieldius.

In fragm. XX. metrum idem est quod in fragmm. XI. XII. XIII. XIV. XV. ut testatur versiculus, *Οὐκ ἐπισταμένα τὰ βράκε' ἔλκειν ἐπὶ τῶν σφυρῶν.*

Fr. LXVI. sic videtur ordinandum *χαῖρε, Νύμφα· χαῖρε, τίμιε γαμβρὲ, πολλά.* Ultima vocis *νύμφα* brevis est, quemadmodum in Latinâ *nymphă.*

N. A.

PROLOGUS IN EUNUCHUM.

FABULAM AB ALUMNIS REG. SCHOL. WESTM. ACTAM, A.D. 1816.

VESTRUM, Patroni, quos salvere plurimum
Lætus lubensque jubeo, nemini fere
Dubium videri credo, qualem flagitent
Tempusque præsens resque nostra Prologum.
An hasce quisquam prorsus accedit fores,
Nec sancti illius meminit et chari senis,
Quem noster omnis luget extinctum chorus,
His ante suetum præsidere lusibus?
Illo Hercle nemo notior cunctus fuit,
Magisve amatus aut honoratus magis,
Magisve cunctis flebilis, credo, occidit;
Vel queis Palæstræ prisca nostræ gloria,
Atque ipsi cordi est Publica Institutio;
Vel queis honestum literarum et artium
Studium est bonarum, et verus in pretio labor,
Moresque faciles, innocentes, simplices,
Pectusque liberale, sincerum, pium.
Immo sepulti plurimas laudes licet
Taceat modestus iste sepulchralis lapis,
At non suorum vox tacebit publica:
Non, ipsa donec nostra stabunt mœnia,
Sanctumque juxta tollet hæc ædes caput,
Perire Eliza gloriam sinet memor
Ipsis ab usque cunis omnino sui
Alumni, Præceptoris, Præsidis, Patris.
At tu, laboris quem patronum ludicri,
Prima lubentes consalutamus vice,
Et ante carum, et cetera alienum licet,
At mente tota, credimus nostrum tamen,

Tu, sancte præses, quæ nec uno nomine,
Nec nunc, fatemur, denique deberi tibi
Obsequium, honorem, gratiamque plurimam,
Hilaris, rogamus, et benignus accipe,
Studiumque nostrum numine adjuta tuo.
Et tu, qui nostræ sæpius Comœdiæ,
Curator olim, nunc spectator interes,
Quocunque nobis carus idem tempore,
Et nunc, et olim; tu, pater, salve quoque:
Fas tibi, desuetos jam revisenti lares,
Veteris gratemur memores consuetudinis:
Fas et precemur (quippe laudi maximæ
Tibi placuisse duximusque et ducimus)
Fas sit precemur, ut quæ votis omnium
Nostra hæc, curante te, respondebat prius,
Tuis Thalia votis nunc respondeat;
Et quem docebas ante, nunc plaudas gregi.

EPILOGUS.

GNATHO. THRASO.

G. Quid nunc, magne Thraso? quid agis? quænam ista repente
Tristitia, et nubes ista supercilii?
T. Occidimus. Mavors timuit quem perdere, tandem
Infelix ausa est perdere pauperies.
Quæ bellum dederat, pax omnia dilapidavit,
Nec, nisi mors, tanto est ulla medela malo.
G. Turpe viro damnis succumbere, tu modo forti
Sis animo; ad famam promta lucrumque via est.
Quæ tibi nunc se forte offert occasio præsens,
Arripe.
T. Quam narras?
G. Pauca docendus eris.
Nostra quidem tellus scis fontibus omnis abundat,
Qui medicinales ejaculantur aquas.
Huc coëunt ægri, sani, mas, fœmina, cœlebs,
Pupillus, mater, nympha, puella, senex,
Rusticus, urbanus, fur, judex, scurra, sacerdos,
Mercator, miles, causidicus, medicus.
Ipsa valetudo paucos, plerosque voluptas
Invitat, lusus, alea, scena, chori.
Pro se quisque simul perdunt et tempus opesque:
Saltando interea summus habetur honos.
Ergo deligitur, qui cœtibus hisce magister
Præsidet, ille choros ordinat, ille regit.

Hunc regem observant, hunc admirantur, amantque ;
Huic facili pendunt larga tributa manu :
Nunc audi—Forte urbs, cui nomen Calda dederunt,
Sanando apta homini balnea, et apta sui,
Extinctum nuper Regem desiderat ; illuc
Tu, mage dignus enim nemo, petitor eas.
T. Quid ? peregrinus ego ignotusque !
G. Hoc dignior ipso.
Nunc sunt grata magis, quæ peregrina magis ;
Et miles palmam nunquam non proripit. Ille est
Quem vir formidat ; quemque puella cupit.
T. Scilicet idque datum est, fateor, mihi ; nempe Thrasoni
Est carus Mavors, sed mage cara Venus.
Primus item saltare labor, pugnare secundus ;
Si multum manibus, plus valeo pedibus.
G. Credo equidem.
T. Immo etiam, quo tantum nomine Achilles
Laudatur, quantum quod πόδας ὠκὺς erat.
Hic ergo et gladios, et cetera Martia pono ;
Buccina rauca, vale, tibia mollis, ave.
Ille ego sum qui multiplices motusque figurasque ;
Et quibus aptetur quæque chorea modis :
Unius passumque trium, passumque duorum
Qua lege alternent, dextra, sinistra manus,
Per medium, sursumque, deorsumque.
G. Ah bone, num tu
Nostrorum ingeniis ista placere putas ?
Sordent jam veteres istæ, patriæque choreæ ;
Hoc hodie celebrat sola Culina genus.
Nunc in deliciis saltatio Ionica habetur ;
Illa quidem mollis, blanda, soluta, levis.
Nec virgo hanc matura viro jam sola choream,
Sed matura rei cuilibet uxor, amat.
T. Non vos cognôram tam bellos tamque venustos !
Hanc quoque me nemo callet, amatve magis.
Hac ego vel lauros etiam pro laude paciscar,
Huic etiam imperium posthabuisse velim.
G. Imperium narras ? Hoc omni spondeo majus
Imperio, inque viros scilicet, inque nurus.
Quin tu linque aliis, equites, peditumque cohortes
Instruere, et vulgus vi cohibere ferum ;
Hæ tibi erunt artes ; nempe advenientibus ultro
Gratari hospitibus ; visere, et excipere,
Orchestramque, fidesque, atque instrumenta choreæ,
Curare ut bello sint satis apta gregi.

Quo standum sit cuique loco, quocunque sedendum
Præcipere, et quæ cui sit socianda manus:
Fœmineos bene nôsse gradus, proavosque genusque,
Qui sit cuique ordo, qui tribuendus honos.
Fœmineas etiam interdum componere lites:
Interea loculis consuluisse tuis.
Hoc opus omne tuum, officium nec dignius ullum
Est homine, officio nec mage dignus homo.
Quin age; propositi brevis est occasio lucri;
Ora, ambi, propera. Quid dubitas?
T. Propero.
Hos primum appello: Vos, ornatissime cœtus,
Si quid virtutes commeruere meæ,
Votis quisque meis, precor, adspirate.
G. Meisque.
T. Vos modo plaudatis: Cetera salvus ero.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS

Relating to the Discovery of the Inscription upon the Column of Diocletian at Alexandria.

A NOTE in French in the last number (XXVIII.) of your Journal, under the head of *Curæ Posteriores*, p. 359. requires a few remarks from me. It is there said, (referring to that part of my paper in the *Classical Journal*, No. XXV. p. 153. which relates to the inscription upon the column of Diocletian at Alexandria.) "Cette inscription fort bien lue par M. le Colonel Leake, avoit déja été lue à peu près aussi bien et apportée en France par M. Jaubert; et Villoison l'expliqua très doctement dans le Magasin Encyclopédique, 8ème année t. 5. p. 55. (29 Janv. 1803.) Cette explication de M. de Villoison a été réimprimée dans le 3ème volume de l'Itinéraire de M. de Chateaubriand après la page 216. La copie de M. Jaubert, &c." The inference which the unprepared reader would draw from these words is, that M. Jaubert, having been at Alexandria, and having first brought the inscription to Paris, is to be considered as the discoverer or original copier of it: that M. de Villoison first explained it, that M. de Chateaubriand copied M. Villoison's reading and explanation, and lastly that I now come with a new reading differing in nothing essential from the former, except the word ANIKHTON, which I borrow from Mr. Salt. Your annotator however must have perceived (if he

perused the article in No xxv. of the Class. Journ.) that the explanation and reading of the Inscr. are only an incidental object of that paper, which was published in your Journal for the purpose of relating the circumstances and facts of the discovery, they having been much misrepresented. M. Jaubert and M. de Villoison knew very well that no person in the French expedition had deciphered one word of the inscription,[1] and that M. Jaubert's copy brought by him to Paris in 1803, was nothing more than *our* copy, which had been supplied to him at Alexandria, where, as well as in Italy, it had been generally circulated: and M. Jaubert may perhaps have verified it by comparing it with the original upon the column. Neither M. Jaubert nor M. de Villoison however had the candour to state these circumstances, (of which it is impossible they should have been ignorant) in their publication of the inscription at Paris, where it would perhaps have been a crime in those days to lose any convenient opportunity of detracting from Englishmen, and of adding, *quocunque modo*, a leaf of laurel to the great nation. These unworthy feelings, however, are now at an end, and I am sorry therefore to find your annotator (inadvertently perhaps,) giving countenance to the unfair proceeding of M. Jaubert and M. de Villoison. He is incorrect also in saying that M. de Chateaubriand transcribed M. de Villoison's explanation into his book, for M. de Chateaubriand's remarks upon the inscription are confined to a very few suggestions, and instead of the word ὁσιώτατον, which M. de Villoison has well supplied in the first line, M. de Chateaubriand proposed σοφώτατον. The following words of M. de Chateaubriand may be here inserted, as furnishing evidence upon the present enquiry.

...."l'inscription de la Colonne de Pompée. Je crois être le premier voyageur qui l'ait rapportée en France. Le monde savant le doit a quelques officiers Anglois; ils parvinrent à la relever en y appliquant du plâtre. Pococke en avoit copié quelques lettres; plusieurs autres voyageurs l'avoient apperçue; j'ai moi même déchiffré distinctement à l'œil plusieurs traits, entr'autres le commencement de ce mot Διον—qui est décisif. Les gravures du plâtre ont fourni ces quatre lignes." Then follow the four lines as originally copied by me in the spring of 1802. They are of course the same characters which M. Jaubert brought to France, and which were furnished to M. de

[1] For a proof of this, see Mémoires sur l'Egypte, (Vol. 1. p. 64.) where M. Norry regrets that the inscription is no longer legible.

Chateaubriand at Alexandria, exactly in the same manner as M. Jaubert procured his copy.

M. de Chateaubriand was misinformed as to a copy of the inscription having been taken in plaster. No plaster was ever used, but an impression of a part of it was taken in sulphur, which totally failed of the desired effect, and contributed not in the least to the deciphering, which was never assisted by any thing but the rays of the Sun at a particular angle, by frequently viewing the letters at various distances, and by keeping the surface continually wetted with water.

As I am speaking of the misrepresentations, that have been made upon the deciphering of this inscription, I shall take the opportunity of saying, that by no person have the circumstances been less fairly stated than by Dr. E. D. Clarke in the 3d volume of his travels. He takes great pains to assert "that to Lieutenant Colonel Squire the literary world is exclusively indebted for the discovery of the inscription on the pedestal of Pompey's Pillar," as Dr. Clarke wishes it still to be called; that "in September 1801, the inscription was not known to exist, and was considered not merely as illegible, but as altogether lost," and that "all the information, afforded by the inscription itself, would have been consigned to everlasting oblivion, but for the important discovery made by Lieutenant Colonel Squire, of some remaining characters upon the pedestal." Without stopping to consider how an inscription mentioned by Pococke and so many succeeding travellers down to the year 1799, [1] could be considered as totally lost, and not known to exist in 1801, I shall merely state, that I myself, in Sept. 1801, in company with Colonel Squire, as well as other persons, did, in consequence of the information contained in Pococke's book, visit the column, recognize the existence of the inscription, and the identity of two or three of the letters mentioned by that traveller; though without having then the opportunity of observing the important assistance to be derived from a particular light, or the leisure and other conveniences necessary for prosecuting the enquiry.

Dr. Clarke represents Colonel Squire as having made a claim to the discovery in a private letter contradictory of his public narrative of the transaction as printed in the Archæologia, vol. 15. p. 59. But there is no such claim in the letter of Colonel Squire. He speaks only of having discovered most of the letters before the arrival of Mr.

---

[1] This is the date of M. Norry's memoir, first published in the Decade Egyptienne at Cairo.

Hamilton and myself at Alexandria from Upper Egypt, and there is a wide difference between distinguishing, or rather imagining that one distinguishes, separate letters and deciphering the words and general context. Nothing can exemplify this better than the copy of the inscription as attempted by Pococke, who, in endeavouring to copy that of which he had not discovered any one word, or formed any conjecture as to the general structure and meaning, was mistaken in half the letters which he supposed himself to have copied. All that Colonel Squire could boast of having done in December 1801, was to discover (to use his own words in the letter quoted by Dr. Clarke,) "that the inscription was in four[1] lines, and in Greek, and that the two first letters of the last line were πο." And this I can assert was exactly or very nearly the sum total of his discoveries when I arrived at Alexandria in March 1802, and when happening to visit the column exactly at the right time of the day, I deciphered at the first visit the words ΕΠΑΡΧΟΣ ΑΙΓΥΠΤΟΥ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΕΙΑΣ and ΤΟΝ in two places, which shewed the construction of the sentence.[2] The remainder of the deciphered words or fragments of words were obtained by the joint exertions of Messrs. Hamilton, Squire, and myself, to whom I am uncertain whether I ought to add the Honourable Col. Dundas, who frequently accompanied us. ΑΝΙΚΗΤΟΝ has since been supplied by Mr. Salt, not "proposé par M. Salt," as your annotator says, but supplied by an actual inspection of the monument.

You will perhaps think this subject is hardly worth so many words as I have bestowed upon it. It is the same feeling that has made me so long neglect replying to Dr. Clarke's observations, which I cannot but consider as founded in error, and unjust towards me.

W. M. LEAKE.

There are two omissions in my former communications which I shall take this opportunity of supplying. To the article relating to the inscriptions at Skripu, published in your Journal No XXVI, I omitted to annex my name, the necessity of which precaution upon these occasions is evident from the foregoing observations upon the inscription of the column of Diocletian. In the article of No. XXVIII, containing the text and translation of the Inscription at Cyretiæ,

---

[1] There are however five lines.

[2] See the account of it in the Archæologia, vol. 15. p. 59. In the same volume, p. 389, the reader may see another account of the Inscription, which has tended to support the misrepresentations that have been made regarding the discovery of it.

I omitted to caution the reader, that there was a difference in one phrase between the French translation in No. XXV, and the English translation in No. XXVIII. In the latter, in consequence of a suggestion of M. Visconti, the words, *οἱ οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ βελτίστου εἰωθότες ἀναστρέφεσθαι*, are rendered "those who are accustomed to be guided by principles not the best," instead of the different meaning of "ceux qui sont accoutumés à ne pas interpréter les actions favorablement."

SOME EXTRACTS

from Arcadius Grammaticus Ms.

At the end of the last Number of your *Journal*, I announced my intention of publishing the book of Arcadius, *Περὶ Τόνων*. I have recently received from my amiable and learned friend Professor Boissonade, a transcript of the Ms. 2102. "de la Bibliothèque Royale de Paris par Grégoire Georgiades Zalyk de Thessalonique," collated with the Ms. No. 2603. which bears the title *Ἀρκαδίου Γραμματικὴ*, and no time will be lost in printing the work at the Leipsic press, under the superintendence of the illustrious Hermann. The transcriber is the same person, who collated the Mss. of Hesiod, for the readings of which the literary public is deeply indebted to Professor Gaisford. Perhaps the following extracts from the work of Arcadius, with the comments upon them, will not be unacceptable to some of your readers.

Ἔτι τὰ διὰ τοῦ ωρης, Διώρης, Λυκώρης, ὅπερ Καλλίμαχος ὀξύνει.

Λυκώρης is the name of a king mentioned in Etym. M. p. 571. 46.: *Λυκωρεία* (*Λυκώρεια*)· *πόλις Δελφίδος, ἐν ᾗ τιμᾶται ὁ Ἀπόλλων, ἀπὸ Λυκώρου κτίσαντος αὐτὴν, υἱοῦ Κωρυκείας, οἰκούντων* (*οἰκοῦντος* Sylb.) *ἐν τῇ Παρνασσῷ.* By Steph. Byz. he is called *Λυκωρεύς*: *Λυκώρεια· κώμη ἐν Δελφοῖς, Καλλίμαχος τρίτῳ, ἀπὸ Λυκωρέως τοῦ βασιλέως.* Callimachus, in the passage here referred to by Steph. Byz. had mentioned the city *Λυκώρεια*, and it should seem from the words of Arcadius that he had also spoken of its founder *Λυκώρης*. Luciani Timon iii. p. 106.: *Μόγις ἔν τι κιβώτιον περισωθῆναι προσοκεῖλαν τῷ Λυκωρεῖ*, i. e. Parnasso. Car. Conr. Reitzius, in his Lexicon Lucianeum, makes the nominative *Λυκωρῆς*, for which he

ought to have said, with Madame Dacier ad Callim. H. in Apoll. 19., Λυκωρεύς.

Arcadius has preserved the Alexandrian term ταὸς i. q. μῶν, which I do not remember to have seen elsewhere, and with which the excellent work of Sturzius de Lingua Alexandrina and the Lexicons of H. Stephens and Schneider may be enriched :—

Τὰ εἰς ος καθαρὰ δισύλλαβα τῷ α μακρὸν παραληγόμενα ὀλίγα εἰσὶ, καὶ ὀξύνεται μὲν ὅσα οὐ κύρια μὴ δὲ ἐπιθετικὰ, παὸς καὶ πηὸς, ναὸς καὶ νηὸς, λαὸς καὶ ληὸς· τὸ Δάος ὡς κύριον βαρύνεται, καὶ τὸ πρᾶος δὲ ἐπίθετον· τὸ μέντοι ταὸς παρ' Ἀλεξανδρεῦσιν ἀντὶ τοῦ μῶν σεσημείωται· τὸ δὲ λάος παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ ἀπὸ γενικῆς εἰς εὐθεῖαν μετεποιήθη. In Cod. Par. 2603. we have ταως and μῶς instead of ταὸς and μῶν. But that ταὸς is the right reading, is apparent from the sense of the passage.

Arcadius furnishes us with an instance of κόνειον for κώνειον, about which I have spoken copiously in the ' Epist. ad Schæferum,' *Class. Journ.* xxviii. p. 294—300. :—Τὰ διὰ τοῦ ειον τρισύλλαβα προπαροξύνονται, εἰ ἡ πρὸ τέλους συλλαβὴ εἰς φωνῆεν λήγοι, ὄνειον, κόνειον, γένειον, δάνειον.

The following words, which are not to be found in the Thesaurus of H. Stephens, are preserved by Arcadius. I have prefixed a star to such as do not occur in the Lexicon of Schneider :—

* Μεμψίδιος—* Αυσίδρως—* Χρυσέρως—* Δείλανδρος—* 'Ομόγραυς—* Υπεράοιδος—'Υλοκουρὸς,[1] ὁ τὴν ὕλην τέμνων—'Ελουρος—* Σόφιλλος, nom. propr.—* 'Ομόσυνος—* Νομίουρος, ὁ τὴν νομὴν φυλάττων—* Θέρμασσα, ἡ κάμινος—* Κραταπαλλὸς, εἶδος νομίσματος—* Μάρδος, αὐλοῦ εἶδος—* Δαμὴν—* Τελλὴν — * Πιπελὴν—'Ωλλὴν[2]—* Κελὴν—* Κίνυψ—* Σκώληψ—* Πλινθιβάψ—Πελεθοβάψ[3]—* Ψόραψ—* Τυρόκλεψ—* Σκευότειψ—'Ιπποβοσκὸς—* 'Ιπποβοσκῶ—* Χαμαισκώληξ—* 'Αντίσπληξ—* Πόλτυνος— Εὔρω, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ εὑρίσκω—* Λιβανῶ—

---

[1] This word occurs in Lycophro v. 1111. where Muller says :—" Vit. 2. et 3. ὑλακουργὸς, fors. ὑλοτομὸς, ξυλοτόμος." 'Υλοκουργὸς Vat. 972. ὑλακουργὸς Vat. 916. I entertain no doubt that ὑλοκουργὸς is the true reading, which is confirmed by Arcadius, who in all probability had the verse of Lycophro in his eye. Muller in the Index Vocabulorum has erroneously written ὑλόκουρος for ὑλοκουρὸς. Arcadius : Τὰ εἰς ρος ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς παραληγόμενα οὐ προπαροξύνεται, Ἐπίκουρος, ἐπάρουρος ὁ κηπουρὸς, ἵλουρος ἰθυκίνδ., μελάνουρος, παλίνουρος, παλίουρος τὸ φυτόν· σεσημείωται νομίουρος ὁ τὴν νομὴν φυλάττων, καὶ ὑλοκουρὸς ὁ τὴν ὕλην τέμνων.

[2] Leg. 'Ωλλὴν, ἵνος, ὁ, whence comes 'Ωλλήν. This word, omitted by H. Steph. is mentioned by Suidas. See Schneider's Lex. v. 'Ωλλήν.

[3] In Hesychius, whom Schneider follows, it is accented differently, Πελεθόβαψ.

Δαγκάνω—* *Βουκάμπη, ἡ τῶν βοῶν κάμπη*[1]—* *Ὑπερθημοσύνη*[2]—* *Τρόχους*[3]—*Βροτοσσόος*[4]—* *Δυοσκόος*—* *Φυλάξιος*—* *Ἔψιος*—* *Φλόγειος*—* *Παντογκύνη*[5] *ἡ ταραχώδης γυνὴ*—* *Ἅρπης*—* *Ἁρπῆσσα*—* *Χερνῆσσα*—* *Πολυπάταγος*[6]—* *Ἄττην*—* *Κορδυλὴν*—* *Μαραθὴν*—* *Περπερὴν*—* *Τριβὴν, ὁ τρίπους*—* *Βίλλος*[7]—* *Βιλλίν.*

The above list does not profess to contain all the words mentioned by Arcadius, which are not to be found in the Thesaurus of H. Stephens. But they are produced with the view of drawing the attention of scholars to the too long neglected work of Arcadius, abounding as it does with similar terms, for which you would in vain consult the best Lexicographers, and which, in the hands of such critics as HERMANN, SCHÆFER, and BOISSONADE,

---

[1] Cod. 2603. *φάτνη.* "Βουκάπαι, αἱ, Boum præsepia, *τῶν βοῶν αἱ φάτναι*, Hesych." H. Steph. Thes. i. 774. c.

[2] *Τὸ δὲ ὑπὲρ δύο συλλαβὰς συστέλλει το υ διὰ τὸ συνη, περὶ σύνης, βριθοσύνη, ὑπερθημοσύνη.* The reader, who takes the trouble of comparing this passage with what is said by Draco Stratonicensis in p. 29, 9. 64, 24. 86, 21. 100, 17. will perceive that *ὑποθημοσύνη* was the word written or dictated by Arcadius. See the Lex. Xenophonteum v. "Ὑποθημοσύνη.

[3] *Τὰ δὲ πολλὰ σύνθετα παροξύτονά τε καὶ περισπαροξύτονα· καὶ παροξύτονα μὲν δυσκόης, λαοσσόος, βροτοσσόος, προπαροξύτονα δὲ τρόχος, δυσκόος.* I am unable to discover the meaning of *δυσκόης.* That under *τρόχος* lies concealed some word of four syllables, similar to the other words with which it is joined, is evident; but I must leave to the critics to settle what that word is.

[4] Schneider refers to the Orphic poems de Lapidibus for the use of this word, which he accents thus, Βροτόσσοος. The passage is v. 750. in Hermann's edit.:—
Καρτερὰ φάρμακα σεῖο, βροτοσσόε θέσκελε πέτρη.

[5] The true reading is Παντοκύκη. Phrynichus Σοφ. Προπαρ. in Bekkeri Anecd. Gr. T. i. p. 61.:—*Παντοκύκη γυνή· ἡ οὕτω πανοῦργος, ὡς καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν κυκᾶν, ὡς Πηξιθέαπτα ἡ τὴν θάλασσαν [θάλατταν] πῆξαι δυναμένη, ἤκιστα πηγνυμένην· καὶ ἐπὶ ἀῤῥένος τὸ ὁμοιον ἐρεῖς.* Both these words may be added to the Lexicons of H. Stephens and Schneider. The compound term *παντοκύκη* may serve to confirm what I have said in the volume which I some time ago published of *Classical Recreations*, p. 211., about the proverbial phrase *κυκᾶν πάντα, miscere omnia, miscere cœlum et mare.*

[6] Λέγει δὲ ὁ Τεχνικὸς ὅτι αἱ μεταπεπλασμέναι δοτικαὶ ἔχουσι τὸ ι προπαροξύνονται, ἐὰν μὴ δυσυλλαβία κωλύσῃ, ὁ πολυπάταγος τοῦ πολυπατάγου, τῷ πολυπατάγῳ, καὶ κατὰ μεταπλασμὸν πολυπάταγι ἀναβιβάζει, κ. τ. λ. For *δυσυλλαβία* read *δισυλλαβία.* "Omnes voces, quæ a *δύο* componuntur, semper Græci per *ει* expresserunt, non autem per *ῠ* aut *ῡ*, ad vitandum malum omen, ut puto," Palmerius Exercitt. p. 6. See No. II. of the new *Greek Thesaurus*, p. cccxxxix. not. 3. Of this famous Canon of Palmerius I have spoken at much length in some observations on a fragment of Hesiod lately communicated to the learned Professor LENNEP. The words *δισυλλαβία, ἰσοσυλλαβίω, ἰσοσύλλαβος*, and *ἰσοσυλλάβως*, (the last mentioned is not to be found in Schneider's Lexicon,) and also *ὑπερδισύλλαβος* employed by Arcadius, may be added to the Thesaurus of H. Steph.:—*Πρέσκεται ἰσοσυλλάβως, διὰ τὸ παχὲς παχύ, ἤτις διὰ τὴν συναίρεσιν ἰσοσυλλαβεῖ.* The word *γαλακτοποιὸς*, unknown to both these Lexicographers, is employed by Arcadius:—*Γλαύξ, βοτάνη γαλακτοποιός.* Etym. M. 232. 37.:—*Γλάξ· βοτάνης εἶδος γαλακτοποιητικῆς.* *Γαλακτοποιητικὸς* may also be added to the Thesaurus of H. Stephens.

[7] *Τὸ σίλλος, καὶ βίλλος· τὸ ἀνδρεῖον αἰδοῖον, τὸ κοινῶς βιλλίν, παρὰ Ἐφεσίοις βαῤῥύνεται.*

distinguished by their sagacity, erudition, and industry, may throw much light on many obscure, and be employed successfully to correct many corrupt, passages in the ancient Greek writers.

The two following words are not mentioned by Jablonski in his Glossary of Egyptian terms: I am not aware that they are to be found anywhere but in Arcadius:—

Τὰ εἰς ως Περσικὰ ἢ Αἰγύπτια παροξύνεται, Φάργως, Ἰνάρως.

The following words of Arcadius will enable us to decide upon the true reading of a passage in Steph. Byz. which Berkelius has thought proper to alter against the authority of the Mss. and the most ancient editions:—

Τὰ εἰς ρις Αἰγύπτια, says Arcadius, *προπαροξύνεται, Βούσιρις, Ὄσιρις, Ψένυρις.*

Steph. Byz.: *Κορκυρίς· πόλις Αἰγύπτου, ὡς Ἀλμυρὶς, Ἀργυρίς· ἡ δὲ Ψέντρις Αἰγυπτία κώμη βαρύνεται.*

So the words are printed in the edition of 1694. "In omnibus libris," says Berkelius, "editum erat *Ψενύρις, Αἰγύπτιος κώμη*, quod loco movimus, et emendavimus, auctoritate ipsius Stephani: *Ψέντρις· Αἰγυπτία κώμη, κλίνεται Ψέντρεως, τὸ ἐθνικὸν, Ψεντρίτης.*" But that the old reading *Ψενύρις*, or, as Arcadius marks the word, *Ψένυρις*, is the right one, is apparent from the passage in Arcadius. I leave others to determine the identity between *Ψένυρις* and *Ψενηρὸς*, of which Steph. Byz. says: *Ψενηρός· Αἰγυπτία κώμη, τὸ ἐθνικὸν Ψενηρίτης, τῷ τύπῳ τῆς χώρας.* L. Holstenius considers them as the same, and his belief in their identity would have been strengthened, if he had perceived that *Ψενηρὸς* is a false reading for *Ψενηρὶς*, as appears from the gentile *Ψενηρίτης*, which is formed not from *Ψενηρὸς*, but from *Ψενηρίς*. *Ψενηρὸς* would, I think, give *Ψενήριος*: this form is certainly much more common than the other, *Ψενηρὸς*, *Ψενηρίτης*.

But, to return to the passage of Arcadius, Berkelius is equally mistaken in what he has written about the word *Ἀλμυρίς*:—"Ptolemæo Mareotis vicus *Ἀλμύραι* dicitur, quem forte Noster alia terminatione protulit." That Steph. Byz. in employing the word *Ἀλμυρὶς*, had an Egyptian town or village in his mind, not the Mareotis vicus *Ἀλμύραι*, is evident from his own words: *Κορκυρὶς· πόλις Αἰγύπτου, ὡς Ἀλμυρὶς, Ἀργυρίς.* There would not have been the analogy, in respect to the accent, between *Κορκυρὶς* and *Ἀλμυρὶς*, of which Steph. B. speaks, if *Ἀλμυρὶς* had not been an Egyptian town. His meaning is that the Egyptian word *Κορκυρὶς* is accented in the same way as the Egyptian words *Ἀλμυρὶς* and *Ἀργυρὶς*, and he then adduces an exception in the mode of accenting the Egyptian word *Ψένυρις*.

On the very same grounds, on which I have objected to Berkelius's note on *Ἀλμυρὶς*, I object to what he has written about the

other word *Ἀργυρίς*:—"*Ἀργυρὶς* apud auctorem nostrum aliis in locis non occurrit. Legitur quidem *Ἄργυρις*, sed quia de illo oppido e Philisto mentionem facit, illud Siciliæ adscribendum censeo. Non dubito, quin respiciat Noster *τὸ Ἄργυρα*, urbem Indicam in Taprobane insula, cujus gentile facit *Ἀργυρίτης*. Fortassis hæc utraque terminatione, et *Ἀργυρὶς* et *Ἄργυρα* dicebatur. Quod si lectori non placuerit, reponatur *Ἄγυρις*, de quo Steph. suo loco: *Ἄγυρις· νῆσος ἐν τῇ Ἐρυθρᾷ Θαλάσσῃ, τὸ ἐθνικὸν Ἀγυρίτης, διὰ τὴν συνήθειαν τοῦ τόπου· Ὁμηρίται γὰρ καὶ Σαβαΐται, καὶ ἄλλα παραπλήσια πλεῖστα.*"

To the examples already cited of Egyptian words denoting cities or towns, ending in *υρις*, may be added from Steph. Byz. *Τεντυρίς*.

Arcadius: *Τὸ δὲ σισαμῆ περισπᾶται ὡς ἐκ συναιρέσεως.* To the authorities quoted in No. II. of the new Greek Thesaurus p. cccxlii. not. 3. (where the form *σησαμῆ* in Aristoph. Pac. 869. is vindicated against the correction of Brunck, who reads *σησαμοῦς*,) may be added this passage in Arcadius, and the observation made in p. cccxliv. b. of the same Number, that the later Greek writers wrote *σίσαμον, σίσαμος, σισαμὶς*, not *σήσαμον, σήσαμος, σησαμὶς*, may be further confirmed from the same passage, where we have *σισαμῆ* for *σησαμῆ*. See Schneider Ind. ad Rei Rust. Scriptt. p. 335.

Arcadius: *Ἔτι τὰ εἰς θις ὑπερδισύλλαβα ὀξύνεται μὴ ὄντα ὀνόματα πόλεων Αἰγυπτίων, ἀκανθὶς, κολοκυνθὶς, τὸ δὲ Ταμίθις καὶ Μενούθις καὶ Τερενούθις βαρύνεται.*

In Steph. Byz. we have *Ταμίαθις*, not *Ταμίθις*, and *Μένουθις*, not *Μενούθις*. In Epiphanius, Ancorato c. 108. the wife of Canobus, who doubtlessly gave her name to the place, is called *Εὐμενουθὶς*, for which Jablonski, L. Holstenius and Berkelius read *Μενουθὶς*, or *Μένουθις*. The word *Τερενούθις*, which Arcadius alone seems to have preserved, most probably was the name of some Egyptian town.

H. Stephens in his Lexicon Vetus (see the new Gr. Thes. p. ccxxxix. a.) found *Βεχεὶρ* written for *Μεχείρ*. But in Arcadius it is *Βλέχειρ*: *Τὰ εἰς ειρ ὑπὲρ μίαν συλλαβὴν, ἀσυνήθη μὲν, τὰ δὲ εὑρεθέντα βαρύνεται, Βλέχειρ, Σάπερ*, read *Σάπειρ*, (see the new Gr. Thes. p. cccxxxiv. b.)

Arcadius: *Ἔτι τὰ εἰς αρης, εἰ μὴ ἐπίθετα εἴη, Κυαξάρης, Παντάρης, Σωχάρης.* What are we to understand by the word *Σωχάρης*? Is it the name of some Persian? or is it the Egyptian god called by Hesych. *Σόχαρις*, of whom Jablonski speaks, in the new Gr. Thes. p. cclxxxi. b.?

Arcadius: *Τὰ εἰς τος κύρια ἢ ἐπίθετα παραληγόμενα τῷ ῆ μονογενῆ βαρύνονται· εἰ* (sic Cod.) *προπαροξύτονα, Ἄρητος, Δάμητος, Μέλητος, Βύνητος εἶδος ἱματίου παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις.* Alberti in the Excerpta from

Arcadius (in the hand-writing of Is. Vossius, preserved in the Remonstrants' Library at Amsterdam, of which Professor Lennep has most obligingly favored me with a transcript,) as well as Tewater (see the new Gr. Thes. p. ccxiv. not. 4.) found *Βύνετος* for *Βύνητος*, and Jablonski found the word so written in the Excerpta made by Ez. Spanheim. But that *Βύνητος* is the true reading, is evident from the context.

In the new Gr. Thes. p. ccxxvii. b. *Κομμίδιον* is quoted from the Schol. ad Nicandri Alex. 110. The same word occurs in Arcadius: *Τὰ εἰς ῑ μονογενῆ ὑπὲρ μίαν συλλαβὴν βαρύνεται, μέλι, κίλι [κίλει] εἶδος ἐλαίου, κόμμι τὸ κομμίδιον, πέπερι, κιννάβαρι, σίνηπι.* In Cod. Par. 2603. we have *Κόμι τὸ κομίδιον.* See Du-Cange's Greek Glossary v. *Κόμι.* Du-Cange found in Zozimus Ms. de Instrumentis et Caminis, *μετὰ κόμεως*, and again, *καὶ κόμι.* He quotes from the Glossæ Colbert. Ms. *Κόμι· τὸ κομήδην*, and from Lex. Ms. ex cod. Bibl. Cod. 2199. *Κόμιδιον [Κομίδιον]· τὸ τοῦ δένδρου δάκρυον.* This Lex. Ms. is no other than Zonaras's Lexicon: see Zonaras p. 1240. and Phavorinus, who copied the words from the Ms. of Zonaras.

Suidas, and, after Suidas, Phavorinus: *Κόμμι· καὶ ὁ λιβανωτὸς, καὶ τὸ ἐξηραμμένον ὀπῶδες δάκρυον.* Zonaras p. 1140. and Phavorinus interpret *Κόμμι* by *Ψιμμίθιον.* "Scilicet *κόμμι* admixtum *ψιμμυθίῳ*," Tittmann. I suspect that this use of the word was peculiar to the later Greeks; for I have not discovered any trace of it among the older Greeks. But I am inclined to think that Zonaras was mistaken in supposing *Κόμμι* to be ever used in the sense of *Ψιμύθιον*, i. e. genus coloris quo meretrices jam senescentes fucare faciem solent ad sulcos rugarum explendos et ad candorem conciliandum, (see the new Gr. Thes. p. cccxxx. b.). My doubts are considerably augmented by what I read in the Schol. ad Platon. p. 151. who tells us that *Κόμμι* was used by the ladies for a very different purpose:—*Κόμμι· λέγεται τὸ ἐκ τῶν δένδρων, ἅτε δὴ δάκρυον, ἀποῤῥέον ὑγρὸν, ᾧ χρῶνται πρὸς τὰς τρίχας τῶν γυναικῶν, ὥστε μὴ διαχεῖσθαι αὐτὰς, ἀλλὰ μένειν ὡς ἄγαν συνημμένας, ἐφ' οὗ βεβούληνται σχήματος αἱ Κομμώτριαι· παρ' οὗ* [read, with Bast. ad Gregor. Cor. p. 103. *παρ' ὃ*] *καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦδε τοῦ κόμμεως λέγονται καὶ ἡ τέχνη κομμωτική.* The Scholiast is, however, egregiously mistaken in supposing that *Κομμώτρια* is derived from the word *Κόμμι*, i. e. the gum used for the purpose of adjusting the curls according to the fashion of the day. I should be much more disposed to believe that the *Κομμώτριαι* derived their name from *Κομμῶ*, i. e. the priestess employed to sweep the floor of Minerva's temple. *Λέξεις ῥητορικαὶ* in Bekkeri Anecd. Gr. T. i. p. 273.: *Κομμώ· ἡ κοσμοῦσα τὸ ἕδος τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἱέρεια.* This word *Κομμῶ* may be added to the Lexicons of H. Stephens and Schneider.

Arcadius: *Τὸ δὲ Θῶνος ἀπὸ τοῦ Θώνιδος καὶ Θώνιος Ἰωνικῶς καὶ κράσει Θῶνος, ἢ ἀπὸ Θώνιος εὐθείας κατὰ συγκοπήν.* See the new Gr. Thes. p. cccxxvi. a. and the Index to Nos. I. and II. p. ix. not. 9.

Thetford, EDMUND HENRY BARKER.
3d March, 1817.

RICHARDI BENTLEII EPISTOLA AD GODOFR. RICHTERUM.

The following letter of the illustrious Bentley was first published in a work entitled "Gotefridi Richteri Bernbacensis Specimen Observationum Criticarum in varios Auctt. Gr. et Lat. Præfationem præmisit J. F. Buddæus. Jenæ. MDCCXIII. 8vo." The letter had been addressed to Richter himself, who appears to have left no other traces of his existence than those which this work contains. It is of rare occurrence: the letter has therefore been lately extracted, and inserted by the learned F. A. Wolf, in the first Number of his *Litterarische Analekten,* now publishing at Berlin. This addition, however slight, to the letters of Bentley published in 1807, by Dr. Burney, and republished, by the permission of that illustrious Scholar, in the *Classical Journal,* must be received with gratitude by every English Scholar. No date appears to the letter, as first published, in 1713, but we are referred by the last Editor to the Pref. to Manilius, p. 14, in which the year, at least, in which the correspondence took place, may be ascertained to be 1709.

Litteras a te nudius tertius accepi longe gratissimas, in quibus ultro operam tuam polliceris in describendis veterrimi exemplaris Manliani variis lectionibus. Hanc tuam erga me et meliores litteras tam promtam ac prolixam voluntatem, stultus sim, si repudiem; inhumanus, si non gratissime agnoscam. Liceat igitur posthinc in amicorum meorum numero te quoque recensere, et amicitiæ recentis tesseram Manilianas lectiones a te exspectare. Scias autem, me ab aliquot annis semel atque iterum ex eodem vestro Codice nactum esse excerpta quædam,[1] sed mutila et imperfecta, quod ex aliis Codicibus paris ferme cum vestro ætatis certo mihi compertum. Quattuor tantum, quod sciam, in tota Europa nunc exstant exemplaria, quæ annorum DC ætatem præ se ferunt: Gembla-

[1] These extracts had been made, F. A. Wolf informs us, by J. F. Fellerus, in 1693.

cense scilicet, unde olim Jos. Scaliger posteriorem suam editionem adornavit; Venetum in bibliotheca S. Marci; Vossianum in Academia Leidensi et vestrum illud Lipsiense. Cetera omnia, quorum non pauca penes me habui, sunt notæ recentioris et ab exscriptoribus passim interpolata. Gemblacense autem illud, quod omnium optimum et veterrimum est, ipse oculis meis diligentissime olim perlustravi, minutissimas quasque variationes scrupulose notavi. Ceterorum collationes, quæ Gemblacensi in plerisque omnibus adstipulantur, amicorum opera comparavi: unde facile erat deprehendere, juvenes illos, qui Lipsiensis libri excerpta mihi subministrabant, vix decimam lectionum partem attigisse. Quamobrem, si operam et mihi et auctori ipsi utilem navare vis, oro te atque obtestor, ut minima quæque observare et in Bœclerianæ editionis margine notare ne dedignere; quanto mendosiora et absurdiora tibi videantur, tanto fidelius et diligentius. Quippe ex illis contaminatissimis, quæ alius forte spreverit et velut indigna notatu præterierit, ego haud raro pulcerrimas emendationes eruo et extundo. Ceterum, quum Manliani codices præ illis reliquorum poetarum sint portentose et pæne supra fidem mendosi, in magnam utique molem exsurgerent tua excerpta, si ex ora tui codicis in chartam puram transcriberes, mihi quoque non necessarium et ideo ingratum laborem injungerent singula rursus in mei codicis marginem inserendi. Patere ergo, ut illud abs te impetrem, ut ipsum codicem tuum Bœclerianæ editionis ad me huc transmittas, ubi semel omnes variantes lectiones in ejus margine descripseris: quod tuum insigne beneficium duobus novæ editionis exemplaribus pensabo. Illud quoque et heic et in aliis (si quando olim in MStis conferendis operam tuam collocabis) te admonuisse non erit inutile; multa scil. in vetustis MStis sub tempore renascentium litterarum jam ab annis circiter trecentis interpolata fuisse, et novas lectiones intrudi solitas, prioribus erasis. Eas, si quæ in vestro codice fuerint, ut sine dubio sunt, facile erit tibi dignoscere vel a colore atramenti, vel a ductu litterarum, vel a vestigiis rasuræ, quæ nunquam evanescit. Illud igitur diligenter curabis, ut singula loca indices, quæ a manu secunda et interpolatrice sint mutata; et, si fieri poterit, deprehendas, quid olim a prima manu scriptum fuerit, sub rasura illa nunc latitans. Porro, ne integra verba describendo totum marginem editionis tuæ oppleas, satius fuerit, litteras tantum lineola subducta notare, et in margine variantes reponere hunc in modum. Pag. postrema tuæ editionis, versu undecimo,

sua lumina } unt
e sublimia }

Cumque vaga est illa et *terris* sua lumina *condit*

Et versu ibid. 15.

m
lu-deest-um
Ms. 1. 2. vant
deest dum ma

Tunc conferta licet cæli fulgentia templa
Cernere seminibus densis *totisque micare*
2. *Floribus* aut *siccæ curvum per littus arenæ,*
1. Nec *spatium stellis, mundo nec cedere summam.*

Has enim crediderim variationes codicem vestrum exhibere, ut ex aliis codicibus licet conjicere. Quis vero non portenta hæc dixerit? Scaliger certe, qui omnia illa in codice Gemblacensi viderat, nihil illinc expiscari potuit. Ex his tamen vestigiis sic veram tibi lectionem restituo :

Cumque vagæ stellæ tenebris sua lumina condunt.
Et
Tum conferta licet cæli fulgentia templa
Cernere luminibus densis totumque micare
1. *Stipatum stellis mundum, nec cedere summa*
2. *Floribus aut siccæ curvum per littus arenæ.*

Atque ex hoc specimine tu conjicito, quantum emendationum in toto libro proferre possim. In illa utique pagella plus triginta dabo : ut, præfiscine dixerim, si quando otium nactus editionem meam procurare possum, jam tum primum in lucem prodire poeta ille jure videri possit.

Quod ad quæstiones tuas adtinet, sic meam sententiam paucis habeto. In Æliani loco (*V. H.* 11. 32.) Ἀλκαῖον potius legerim, quam Ἀλκείδην. Quum enim non, ut alias, judicio et ratione, sed sola auctoritate dirimenda sit hæc controversia, stultum fuerit, pluribus et vetustioribus testibus fidem demere, paucioribus et recentioribus habere. Quæris insuper de notatione nominum Sileni et Satyri. Sine dubio vidisti, quid ὁ πάνυ Bochartus, qui omnium felicissime has origines rimatus est, de his verbis prodiderit in suo Phaleg, ubi prius a שׁוּלָה deducit, posterius a שָׂעִיר, ingeniosius tamen, ni fallor, quam verius; ut pleraque omnia, quæ in illo admirandæ eruditionis opere exsequitur, exceptis, quæ manifeste et toto colore suam produnt originem. Certe, si in ulla eruditionis parte, in hac præcipue τῶν ἐτυμολογιῶν opus est solido et subacto judicio : quo qui destituuntur, turpissime se dare solent et deridendos propinare. Ea enim est indoles linguarum Orientalium, ut si (pro more hominum, qui in ea re hodie lauream quærunt) vocalium nulla ratio habeatur, consonantium autem permutatio tam patienter admittatur, quidvis ex quovis poterit deduci, et tota verborum Græcorum supellex ex Oriente deportari. Superiore sæculo Goropius Becanus, vir alioqui doctus et ingenio non vulgari, omnia linguæ Ebrææ vocabula ex Brabanticis deducere adgressus est : vix magis insanus, quam qui hodie omnia nostra ex Ebræis petere conantur, febriculosis conjecturis et inanibus suspicionibus freti. Hanc tu ut ingeniorum pestem fugias, auctor tibi ero. Nullus enim solidæ doctrinæ fructus, nulla apud cordatos homines gloria provenire hinc poterit. Nunquam igitur tibi dixero, unde Sileni aut Satyri adpellati sint : at, quod longe melius est, id tibi in aurem instillavero, ut in his senticetis ruspandis nolis ingenium tuum et bonas horas conterere. Vale et fac primum me certiorem, ecquid de lectionibus Manilianis a te debeam exspectare.

CORRESPONDENCE.

As your Journal has been occasionally enriched with articles from the pen of Monsieur GAIL, I conclude that you are in habits of correspondence with that learned Hellenist—and as my retirement in the country admits but few opportunities of receiving Parisian information, I shall presume in a future number to offer some queries suggested by the perusal of M. Gail's admirable "*Researches*"[1] which have lately reached me. Those queries through the medium of your widely circulating *Journal*, will probably meet the eye of that celebrated critic himself; and at the same time may attract the notice of other classical readers, from whose replies I should be happy to receive instruction—my questions, it is necessary to premise, do not result from any doubts on the subject of M. Gail's critical accuracy—for his arguments in every respect, and on all branches of literature, that have come under his observation, are to my mind perfectly convincing and appear unobjectionable. But I wish to know, whether some opinions which have arisen from my study of the "*Recherches*" coincide with the learned author's notions; the subjects are chiefly those words, Ἱερὸν, Ναὸς, Τέμενος, and similar terms, which, though of different senses, are too frequently confounded in Translations under the general expressions of Temple, Sanctuary, &c.

2. The text of Thucydides, relative to the ancient or primitive Athens—and 3d. the Chariot race described by Sophocles.

But of this address to you, Sir, the immediate object is to learn what works M. Gail has published. Besides the "*Recherches*" above mentioned, I have only seen his "Observations Littéraires et Critiques sur les Idylles de Théocrite et les Eclogues de Virgile," Two Volumes, duod. Paris 1805.—and his "Atlas pour servir à l'Etude de l'Histoire Ancienne et à l'intelligence des Auteurs Grecs et Latins, 4to. Paris, 1815." containing, in about forty pages of letter-press, three most excellent chronological Tables of the principal events of ancient History, from the Deluge to the birth of Christ; prefixed to above fifty maps and plans, which to the Student of Classical Antiquities, will prove an important acquisition. Among the works of M. Gail, which I have not

[1] "Recherches Historiques, Militaires, Géographiques et Philologiques, spécialement d'après Hérodote, Thucydide et Xénophon, &c. Oct. Paris, 1814. The first volume only has fallen into my hands: I know not whether a second has yet appeared.

yet seen, are his editions of Thucydides and of Xenophon; the latter (according to a *Prospectus*, which appeared some time ago,) in ten Quarto Volumes, comprising the Greek text—with Latin and French Versions. He has also, I believe, published and illustrated with notes, Musæus, Anacreon and some parts of Lucian, and is now engaged (if my information be correct) on Herodotus. The learned Heyne, Beck, and other eminent Scholars have borne sufficient testimony to the merits of M. Gail. (See the *Gottingen Journal*, for March, 1810.—The *Mercure de France*, 4 Nov. 1815.—The *Constitutionel de Paris*, 24 Mai 1816.—The *Magasin* of M. Millin, Tom. II. 1816. &c.) Of Mons. Gail's *Greek Grammar*, two ingenious authors who have since written on the same subject, speak with proper respect; I allude to Messrs. Frémion and Burnouf; and in a letter lately mentioning it, a friend observes, " Après lui (M. Gail) des professeurs de Paris pourront faire des Grammaires Grecques, même sans savoir le Grec." Of the *Recherches* above noticed, I have reason to believe that only one hundred copies were ever printed. Whatever information you can communicate respecting any other works of M. Gail, will be received as a favor conferred on

OMIKRON.

ANNONCE DE XENOPHON,

Par M. Gail.

Œuvres complettes de Xenophon, 10 vol. in 4to., Grec-Latin-François, avec notes et collation de tous les Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque du Roi; Atlas (54 cartes), et riche collection d'estampes (48 planches), prix, 160 f., beau pap. ordin.; et 320 f. pap. vélin satiné, estampes avant la lettre et eaux fortes: on vend separément, 1o. l'Atlas, 36f., et l'extrait de cet Atlas, à l'usage des écoles, 5f.; 2o. les estampes, à l'usage de toutes les éditions soit in 8o. soit in-4o. de Xénophon, 40f.; les mêmes, avant la lettre, et eaux fortes, 70f.

Thucydide et Xénophon son continuateur pour l'histoire, allant ensemble, on rappelle que le prix de Thucydide, Grec-Latin-François, in 4o. pap. vélin est de 145f. et 80f. pap. ordin.: le même, in 8o. 50f.

Postérieurement, a paru un vol. de Recherches historiques, militaires, géographiques, &c. pour l'intelligence de Thucydide et de Xénophon, annoncé dans *Classical Journal*, No. XXV. p. 210.,

les estampes de Thucydide, à l'usage de toutes les éditions in 8o. et in 4o. se vendent 12f. après la lettre, et 18f. avant la lettre, avec les eaux fortes. Ces estampes ont été récemment gravées.

Parmi les hommes qui, depuis une vingtaine d'années, ont le plus contribué à répandre en France le goût de la langue Grecque, il en est peu qui aient des titres plus réels et plus estimables que M. Gail à la reconnoissance publique.

Persuadé de bonne heure que le défaut de livres élémentaires était le principal obstacle qui avait arrêté les progrès du Grec dans l'ancienne Université, il s'efforça de suppléer à ce qui manquait, et s'attacha sans relâche à remplacer les éditions défectueuses qui servaient dans les classes, par des éditions correctes d'ouvrages et d'opuscules choisis, qui pussent former une graduation insensible entre ce que la langue offre de plus élémentaire et ce qu'elle a de plus difficile et de plus élevé.

Dans l'ardeur de son zèle, il ne crut pas encore avoir assez fait ; il ouvrit un cours gratuit de langue Grecque qu'il a continué pendant vingt-deux ans, jusqu'au moment où l'instruction régulière du Grec dans nos écoles, et la création d'une école normale, ont rendu ces soins moins nécessaires. C'est à ce cours qu'une foule de jeunes instituteurs et de jeunes gens, médecins, naturalistes, chimistes, instituteurs, vinrent puiser les premiers principes de la langue Grecque, et chercher les moyens de suppléer à l'éducation imparfaite qu'ils avaient reçue au milieu des troubles et des discordes civiles. Les uns, forcés de retourner aux travaux qui devaient préparer leur avenir, remportèrent au moins de ce cours les notions qu'ils avaient jugées indispensables ; les autres, après avoir franchi les premières difficultés, attirés par le charme toujours croissant que leur offraient la langue la plus belle et la littérature la plus riche, y pénétrèrent plus avant, et finirent par s'attacher exclusivement à une étude qui n'avait d'abord été pour eux qu'un objet secondaire et subordonné. C'est ainsi que M. Gail compte parmi les savans et les littérateurs, plusieurs hommes dont son cours élémentaire a préparé le sort et décidé la vocation.

Si les ouvrages élémentaires du zélé professeur lui firent négliger parfois les vrais intérêts de sa réputation littéraire, ils ne les lui firent pas entièrement oublier, et ne l'empêchèrent pas de publier successivement des traductions d'auteurs difficiles, parmi lesquelles je ne rappellerai ici que celle de Théocrite, accompagnée d'observations littéraires et critiques, où les beautés de ce grand poète sont appréciées avec goût et sagacité. Mais ce n'était là que le prélude de plus importans travaux. Depuis long-temps M. Gail se livrait à une étude approfondie des deux principaux auteurs du siècle de Périclès, je veux parler de Thucydide et de Xéno-

phon, et préparait les matériaux d'une édition complete de ces deux grands écrivains. Soutenu par un zèle infatigable, il s'occupait sans relâche à collationner les manuscrits de la bibliothèque royale, à en réunir les variantes. Arrivé à la fin de ces recherches pénibles, de ces travaux aussi fastidieux qu'utiles, M. Gail en publia successivement plusieurs *Specimen* importans. L'Economique et le traité de la Chasse par Xénophon, et la harangue de Périclès tirée de Thucydide, précédèrent la publication de l'édition et traduction de l'ouvrage de ces historiens, qui parut en 1807 et 1808 : l'édition du texte de Thucydide, entreprise à ses frais, était accompagnée des variantes de treize manuscrits. Elle présentait sous ce rapport un avantage considérable sur toutes les éditions précédentes, puisque celle de Duker donne des variantes de cinq manuscrits seulement, celle de Gotleber, Bauer et Beck, celles de deux manuscrits nouveaux.

L'édition de M. Gail, qui contient les variantes de treize manuscrits, ouvre donc une nouvelle époque pour la critique de Thucydide. Quant à la traduction, il convient lui-même qu'il a beaucoup profité de celle de M. Lévesque, mais il s'est principalement attaché à traduire de nouveau les harangues, et, à cet égard, on s'est accordé à reconnaître que son ouvrage est entièrement neuf.

L'édition de Thucydide détourna pendant quelque temps M. Gail de ses travaux sur Xénophon : il y revint bientôt avec une nouvelle ardeur : l'impression fut continuée, et elle est tout-à-fait achevée maintenant. L'ouvrage se compose de dix volumes in-4o., tous imprimés, que l'on peut se procurer en entier, ou par livraisons. Ils renferment en outre le texte Grec, la version Latine et la traduction Française de tous les ouvrages de Xénophon, les variantes des manuscrits de la bibliothèque royale, discutées dans un volume à part, beaucoup de notes et observations critiques, et un grand nombre de cartes géographiques et de *specimen* de manuscrits.

" Le gouvernement, dit M. Gail, ne m'avait d'abord demandé que le texte Grec, avec la version Latine et collation des manuscrits ; là devait se borner ma tâche, lorsqu'ensuite on m'invita à y joindre la version Française. J'eus beau représenter que l'abeille attique laisse peu de prise sur elle ; que les grâces se traduisent plus difficilement que la force, et qu'ainsi il m'était impossible d'entreprendre la traduction de Xénophon, écrivain aussi difficile à rendre qu'il est en général facile à entendre. On insista, je cédai, en déclarant que je traduirais avec toute l'exactitude dont je pouvais être capable, ce qui n'était pas traduit, ou ce qui l'était mal, comme les Cynégétiques, l'Economique, &c. ; mais qu'en même temps je m'aiderais du travail de MM. Larcher et le Luzerne sur l'Anabase, &c. &c."

D'après cela, on voit que les soins de l'éditeur se sont dirigés principalement sur la partie la plus importante, sur l'édition du texte et la collation des manuscrits. Quant à la traduction, excepté l'Economique, les républiques de Sparte et Athènes, les Cynégétiques, qu'il a traduits avec un soin particulier, il s'en est un peu trop reposé sur ses devanciers, et il a pris leur travail pour base, en y ajoutant toutefois ce que lui inspiroient un examen plus approfondi du texte ou la découverte de quelque variante inédite. " Ainsi, ajoute M. Gail, j'oserai compter sur un peu d'indulgence pour ma traduction. Elle trouvera, je l'espère, grâce devant les gens du monde. Quant aux philologues, qu'il me soit permis de les renvoyer à mes observations historiques, militaires, géographiques, et grammaticales, faites postérieurement à cette traduction." Ces divers passages montrent avec quelle modestie, je devrais dire, avec quelle sévérité, M. Gail juge une partie de sa traduction. Il me permettra de n'être pas tout-à-fait de son avis. Le premier volume renferme les républiques de Sparte et d'Athènes, les Revenus de l'Attique, le Banquet, l'Hiéron, l'Equitation, le Maître de la Cavalerie ; ces divers traités (les deux premiers exceptés) sont compris parmi ceux dont il dit n'avoir ni voulu, ni pu soigner la traduction ; et cependant, en l'examinant comparativement avec d'autres traductions antérieures, j'ai trouvé la sienne, non seulement très-différente, mais elle m'a paru en général à la fois fidèle et facile. Il faut en conclure de deux choses l'une : ou M. Gail a fait plus qu'il n'a cru faire, ou bien il a pu beaucoup plus qu'il n'avait prétendu. La critique ne saurait donc être, pour sa traduction, aussi redoutable qu'il semble le penser ; il a beau permettre " qu'on ne lui sache aucun gré d'avoir traduit plusieurs traités pour la première fois, et d'avoir souvent corrigé ce qui avait été traduit," je doute fort que personne ait assez peu de justice pour profiter de la permission.

Je passerai maintenant à l'analyse des objets discutés dans la deuxième partie du vol. 7. Elle est divisée en deux sections.

La première sous le titre de *Notice des manuscrits de Xénophon et de Thucydide*, est précédée d'observations sur les devoirs d'un éditeur des anciens.

Ces observations ont pour but de montrer les funestes effets de la manie de corriger les textes, qui s'est emparée des philologues les plus distingués. M. Gail fait voir par plusieurs exemples que telle correction jugée indispensable, est, dans le fait, absolument inutile, puisque la leçon du texte offre un sens raisonnable.

La notice instructive des manuscrits de Xénophon est suivie de celle des éditions et traductions de Xénophon qui avaient paru au moment où ce volume a été imprimé. Ainsi on ne doit pas imputer à omission de ne point y rencontrer la petite édition de M.

Schaefer, puis celle des deux traités d'équitation donnée par M. Couvrier.

On trouve ensuite avec plaisir la dissertation de M. Lévesque sur l'orthographe de Thucydide, et l'inscription d'Orripe de Mégare, avec l'explication qu'en a donnée M. Calvet d'Avignon.

Ces deux morceaux servent en quelque sorte d'introduction au *Specimen* des manuscrits. Ce sont des *fac-simile* gravés avec un soin tel, qu'on ne saurait s'imaginer qu'on n'a pas sous les yeux les manuscrits eux-mêmes. Ces *Specimen* ne doivent pas être regardés uniquement comme un objet de luxe et de curiosité. Outre qu'ils sont très-propres à donner une idée de l'écriture des manuscrits de différens siécles, et à éclairer sur les fautes des copistes, le judicieux éditeur a trouvé le moyen de les faire servir à la critique du texte de Xénophon, en faisant calquer principalement les endroits qui présentent des leçons douteuses, qu'il discute dans ses notes critiques.

La deuxième section se compose d'observations littéraires et critiques sur divers traités de Xénophon. M. Gail y suit avec succès la méthode qu'il emploie constamment dans l'explication des anciens. Elle consiste à ne jamais considérer une phrase en elle-même ; mais à l'envisager dans ses rapports avec le contexte. C'est à l'aide de cette méthode qu'il a expliqué beaucoup de passages difficiles, dont le vrai sens n'avait pas encore été saisi.

On peut se procurer séparément l'Atlas qui, ainsi que nous l'avons dit ailleurs, offre une quantité d'apperçus ingénieux qui doivent marquer dans la science.

LETRONNE.

GREEK POEM.

Mr. Editor,

Experience alone can decide on the usefulness of encouraging trials in Greek composition ; where it is wished to produce a clear and exact knowledge of that divine language. And if "in his own department a man may speak with some confidence," I scruple not to say, that a pupil is more beneficially taught to discover his ignorance and to overcome it by a master correcting his essays in Greek, than by any other process with which I am acquainted.

The subjoined attempt of the celebrated John Tweddell gave rise to these remarks ; and as a specimen of his early skill

while under the Rev. MATTHEW RAINE, Master of Hartforth School, it shall with your good leave be made public. *At Hartforth, be it known, he enjoyed all the classical instruction, by which he was prepared to commence his studies at Cambridge, in the October of* 1786.

The verses, indeed, are marked with no date: but as the late Mr. Raine was born 28th November, 1728, it appears pretty clearly that they were composed, at school, as a farewell compliment to his birth-day, in the year 1785.

The errors committed against grammar and prosody are here presented faithfully from the autograph before me. Not many preceptors, even now, would strictly examine and amend those errors; and at that time, I suspect, few pupils of JOHN TWEDDELL's age, unless in the very first of our public schools, or under the tuition of a BURNEY or a PARR, could have been found to write a Greek ἐπίγραμμα with so little incorrectness.

17*th February*, 1817. *R. S. Y.*

His saltem accumulem donis.

Εἰς τὴν τοῦ ἐμοῦ τοῦ ἐντιμοτάτου διδασκάλου γενέθλιον ἡμέραν.

Χαῖρε σύ γ', ἀμέρ', ἐμοὶ κἀμοῖσι σεβάσμιος αἰεί,
(Νῦν κύκλῳ τόδ' ἐμῆς δεῖγμα φιλοφροσύνης,)
Γειναμένη τὸν ἐμεῖο διδάσκαλον —— Εὖ μὲν ἀνέλθοις,
Τῷ δ' εὖ ἀνελθοίσῃ τἄφθονα πάντα φέροις.
Τῶ σε χάριν τὰ μάλιστ' ὑμνήσομεν; Ἐσσὶ μεγίστη
Αἰτία τῶν παντῶν, μοι τὰ μέτεστ', ἀγαθῶν.
Καὶ σὺ, ἀριστόκειος ἀνὴρ, τέκνων ὁ πάνολβος,
(Ἂν μὲν ἔγ' λαμπρῶν πατρί τι χάρμα χόρων.)
Ὕστατον, ὦ τριφίλατος, ἐμᾶς πόνον ἴσχεο Μώσας,
Ὤφελεν ἁ διδαχαῖς ἅσματα τῆνα τεαῖς.
Ἴσχεο·——κἂν δὲ θέλῃς ἔμ' ἐνὶ χαρίεισιν ἀριθμεῖν,
Στηρίξω βλωθρὰν ἐν νεφέλῃς κεφαλάν.

J. TWEDDELL.

METRICAL LINES,

Contained in various Prose Classics.

Several phænomena of this sort have been observed in various ancient writers. The following we have not seen noticed: we give them here merely as a curiosity.

1. Herodotus.

[1]*Η κε μάγ' ολωΐξειεν ὁ Πελοπίδης Ἀγαμέμνων.*	VII. 159.

2. Thucydides.

Καὶ παρ' Ἀθηναίους πρέσβεις, εἶπως πείσειαν.	I. 58.
Τοὺς ἐν τῇ νήσῳ Λακεδαιμονίους καταδῆσαι.	IV. 57.
Ὡς οὐδὲν εὗρον ναυτικὸν πληρούμενον.	VI. 52.
Ὧ Σικελιῶται, τοὺς λόγους ποιήσομαι.	IV. 59.
Καὶ Τισσαφέρνους φείσεται τὰ πράγματα.	VIII. 28.
Εἰ Φαρνάβαζος ἐξ ἐλάσσονος χρόνου.	VIII. ult.

3. Cicero.

Adjumenta hominum desiderat, in primisque.	De Off. II. 11.
Scævola, sane, inquit, vellem non constituissem.	De Or. I. 62.
Cum puerorum igitur formas et corpora magno.	De Invent. II. Procem.
Tum plane luctum omnem absterseris. Hæc Epicurus.	Tusc. Disp. III. 18.
Morbo tentari possunt, ut corpora possunt.	Ib. IV. 14.

4. Livy.

Sedulo, ut adversus montes consisteret hostis.	VII. 15.
Arma, nec Annibali in tanto discrimine rerum.	XXI. 9.
Crudelius, quam Pœnus hostis perdidit.	ib. 19.
Per medios hostes e castris eruperunt.	XXII. 60.
Placavit, victusque patris precibus lacrymisque.	XXIII. 8.
(Virgil has—At socii multo gemitu lacrymisque.	Æn. X.)
Ut paucitatem maxime spernentibus.	ib. 16.
Traduci, atque ibi militare, donec.	ib. 25.
Novendiale, ut assolet sacrum fuit.	ib. 32.
Ut frumenta omnes ex agris, ante Kalendas.	ib. id.
Ante explorato, subsidiis positis.	ib. 41.
Atque alæ magno certamine vix toleratis.	ib. 45.
Ereptas populo Romano restituisse.	XXV. 2.
Conjurat, nisi victores, se non redituros.	XXVI. 25.

[1] From Hom. Il. in Nestor's expostulatory speech: Ἦ κε μάγ' ολωΐξειε γέρων ἱππήλατα Πύλιος.

5. SUETONIUS.

Tendente quoquam, quin Rhodum diverteret. Tib. 12.

It may not be amiss, to bring together some of those already discovered.

Facturusne operæ pretium sim. Hemistich. ap. Liv. Proœm.
Cæci Pompeii veteres fidosque clientes. Sall. Cat. 19.
Urbem Romam a principio reges habuere. Tac. Hist. init.
Magnæ animæ, placide quiescas. Agr. ult.
Πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ, καὶ πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον. N. T.
Τὸν γὰρ ἐν 'Αμφίσσῃ πόλεμον, δι' ὃν εἰς 'Ελατείαν. Demosth.
(See Longin. Frag.)
Hæc ubi dicta dedit, stringit gladium, cuneoque
Facto per medios. Liv. XXII. 52.
Quo vereor, ne si id, quod vis, effecero, eumque
Oratorem, quem quæris, expressero, tandem.
Cic. de Perfect. Orat.
Relligione patrum et priscâ formidine sacram.[1] Tac. Ann.

C. M.

Literary Intelligence.

JUST PUBLISHED.

CLASSICAL.

No. II. of the New and enlarged Edition of H. STEPHENS' GREEK THESAURUS is just published. To this Number is added an Index of all the words, which are discussed in this and the previous Number, distinguishing by a star such as are not contained in the Thes. as published by H. Steph. All the arrangements being now completed by the very recent arrival of Professor Schæfer's learned and copious MS. materials, which the Editors have purchased, the work will proceed without delay, and the Editors confidently expect that they will be able to announce the publication of the third No. very speedily.

The two first Nos. contain about 2000 words omitted by Stephens. A learned pupil of LENNEP's is now engaged in transcribing the numerous notes of Ruhnken and Valckenaer, written on the margin of a Leyden Scapula. The Editors have carefully perused the parts already published for the purpose of ascertaining the typographical errors, and intend to follow Stephens' example in subscribing to the GENERAL INDEX a complete list of errata. The quantity of the doubtful vowels will be marked in the INDEX.

---

[1] See Brotier's Tacitus, by Valpy, Vol. I. p. 366.

A few copies belonging to deceased subscribers may be procured on application, at 1*l.* 3*s.* small, and 2*l.* 10*s.* large paper. The price is soon to be raised again.

The 7th and 8th vols. of Dr. BUTLER'S *Æschylus* have appeared, and complete the octavo edition.

A neat edition of Virgil, collated from the best editions. By A. J. Valpy, A. M. Price 4*s.* bound. 18mo. 2nd ed.

Virgil, with English Notes at the end, original, and selected from the Delphin and other editions. Pr. 7*s.* 6*d.* bound.

The fourth Volume of MATTHIÆ'S *Euripides* is just published; containing the Greek Scholia, (ed. and ined.) of the Hecuba and Orestes. The fifth Vol. is in the press.

A new edition of Homer's Iliad, from the text of Heyne. One vol. oct. 7*s.* bound.

Epitome Sacræ Historiæ, in usum Scholarum; with English notes. Third edition, price 2*s.* 18mo.

Education in Public Schools; containing four tracts, for and against—from the Edinburgh Review, the Classical Journal, the Pamphleteer, and also Dr. Vincent's celebrated tract. Pr. 5*s.* duod. boards.

Academic Errors; or Recollections of Youth. By a Cantab. Duod. 5*s.* 6*d.* bds.

A Translation of the Six Books of Proclus, on the Theology of Plato; to which a seventh book is added, in order to supply the deficiency of another book on this subject, which was written by Proclus, but since lost; also a translation of Proclus' Elements of Theology. By Thomas Taylor. In these volumes is also included, by the same, a translation of the treatise of Proclus, on Providence and Fate; a translation of extracts from his treatise entitled, Ten Doubts concerning Providence; and, a translation of extracts from his treatise on the Subsistence of Evil; as preserved in the Bibliotheca Gr. of Fabricius. In 2 vols. royal quarto, 250 copies only printed. Pr. 5*l.* 10*s.*

Theoretic Arithmetic, in three books; containing the substance of all that has been written on this subject by Theo of Smyrna, Nicomachus, Jamblichus, and Boetius; together with some remarkable particulars concerning perfect, amicable, and other numbers, which are not to be found in the writings of any ancient or modern mathematicians. Likewise a specimen of the manner in which the Pythagoreans philosophised about numbers; and a development of their mystical and theological arithmetic. By T. Taylor. 8vo. 14*s.* bds.

Fragmenta Alcmanis Lyrici collegit et recensuit FRID. THEOPH. WELCKERUS, Prof. Gissensis. 1815. in 4to. pp. 90.

Meletemata e disciplina Antiquitatis: opera Fr. Creuzeri. Pars 1. Anecdota Græca ex Codicibus maxime Palatinis depromta, cum no-

titia illorum librorum et animadversionibus. Lipsiæ, 1817. 8vo. pp. xii+118.

This volume contains, I. Notitia cod. Palatini No. 132, cum excerptis ex eodem et aliis quibusdam. (1.) Loci breviores grammatici maxime argumenti, collati cum aliis Codd. Mss. (2.) De vocibus animalium ex Codd. Palatinis No. 45. et 132. (3.) Nicetæ Serrariensis Metropolitæ Deorum Dearumque epitheta ex Cod. Palatino eruta et collata cum codd. Dresdensi et Monacensi, subjecta singulis epithetis annotatione.—II. Allegoriæ nominum Deorum Dearumque ex Cod. Palatino 40, subjecta editoris annotatione.—III. Aliquot *μυθολογήματα* ex scholiis in Odysseam in Cod. Palatino 45, cum brevi annotatione.—IV. Nonni Narrationes XX. ad Gregorii Naz. Orationem in laudem Basilii M. e duobus codd. Monacensibus, et annotatione illustratæ.—V. Lectiones Platonicæ, e codice Palatino 129. Adduntur scholia aliquot inedita.

The third volume of Beck's Plato has recently appeared: it contains *Gorgias, Ion, Philebus* and *Menon*, with critical annotations.

The learned M. *Silvestre de Sacy* has published an edition of the fables of Pilpay: in 4to.

Μάρκου Ἀντωνίνου Αὐτοκράτορος τῶν εἰς ἑαυτὸν βιβλία ιβ', ὧν προτέθειται τὸ ὑπὸ Θωμᾶ τοῦ ῥήτορος Γαλλιστὶ γεγραμμένον Ἐγκώμιον Μάρκου· φιλοτίμῳ δαπάνῃ τῶν ὁμογενῶν Χίων. Paris. 1816. in 8vo. pp. μδ'+liv+150.

This volume, the editor of which is the learned Dr. Coray, is the fourth of the *πάρεργα τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Βιβλιοθήκης*. This collection is now composed of 14 volumes, the particular account of which is as follows: Æliani Varia, Nicolai Damasceni Fragmenta, Heraclidis Fragmenta, 1 vol. under the title of *Prodromus;* Isocrates, 2 vols.; Plutarchi Vitæ, 6 vols.; Strabonis Geographia, 1 vol.; Polyænus, 1 vol.; Æsopicæ Fabulæ, 1 vol.; Xenocrates, 1 vol.; and M. Antoninus, 1 vol.

Tableau des CCXXIV Clefs de la Langue Chinoise, avec leurs variantes. (Se vend à Paris à l'imprimerie lithographique, Rue du Four, S. G. No. 54.)

This index has been published by M. Abel Remusat, professor of Tatar-Mantchou and Chinese in the Royal College at Paris.

The discoveries of Sig. Angelus Majus, have been reprinted in several parts of Europe.—(Corn. Fronto, Antoninus Pius, &c.) Among others, M. Rupkopf has published these pieces, at Frankfort, in continuation with the notes of Sig. Majus, and proposes to publish, in a reasonable time, another commentary from his own pen, but including whatever the learned and sagacious of Germany have hinted or promulgated on the subject. The first volume contains the Commentary of M. A. Majus, (112 pages) Epistolæ ad Antoninum Pium—Epistolæ ad Marcum Aurelium—ad Verum, imperatorem—ad Amicos—de feriis Alsiensibus— de Nepote amisso. The volume is embellished with well executed portraits of the Emperors Antoninus, Marcus Aurelius, Verus; and a plate containing eight medals.

Ancient writing; Hebrew, &c.—It is extremely difficult to form the slightest judgment, of which correctness is the basis, on works of which we have only heard, but have not seen them. If the authorities cited in the following work may be allowed, it cannot fail of being interesting to every student: if they may be depended on, the author has laid every critic under obligations to him. *Palæographisce Fragmente*, &c. Paleographic Fragments, on the Writing of the Greeks and Hebrews. By G. F. Hezel. 1 vol. 8vo. Berlin. 1816.

It should seem that the author has published these Fragments as a kind of foretaste of a *Systema Grammatico-Criticum Linguæ Hebraicæ*, which he proposes, at no distant time, to publish. The principal subjects treated on are, Researches on the question, whether the Hebrew Language may be admitted as an ancient Shemite dialect?—On the Antiquity of Writing among the Hebrews—that Hebrew Writing originally consisted in Syllables; not in literal characters—from what cause the Hebrews wrote from right to left, and the Greeks from left to right—on the Alphabet of the Hebrews and Greeks, with its use in the Arithmetic of the latter—on the Antiquity of the Names given to the Greek Characters—Explanation of the names given to the Phenician-Hebraic Characters—on the Antiquity of the order of the Characters, in the Hebrew Alphabet—on the Antiquity of the final Letters of the Hebrew Alphabet—on the representatives of the Hebrew Vowels—on the origin of the System of Vowel Points—on the Diacritical Signs adopted in Hebrew Writing—on the Pronunciation of the Vowels, among the Hebrews—on the Hebrew Accents.

ORIENTAL.

A Grammar of the Chinese Language, for the use of the Honorable the Company's servants at China, by the Rev. Robert Morrison, Chinese Secretary to Supercargoes at Canton.

A Translation of the New Testament into Arabic; originally commenced by the late Rev. Henry Martyn, since revised and completed by the Rev. Thomas Thomason, and printed at the expense of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

A K, Huree Bolee and English Vocabulary; by Lieutenant William Price, Assistant Professor of the Bengalee and Sanscrit languages in the College of Fort William.

A collection of Original Letters in the Muhratta language, published for the use of students, by the Rev. Dr. Wm. Carey, Professor of the Bengalee, Sanscrit, and Muhratta languages in the College of Fort William.

The second part of the Qamoos, edited by Shuekh Uhmud, a native of Yumun, in Arabia.

The second edition of the Gooli Bukawulee, for the use of the students in the Hindoostanee department of the college, by Captain Thomas Roebuck, Acting Secretary to the Council of the College, and Public Examiner in the College of Fort William.

The Qootbee, a Treatise on Logic; edited by Muoluvees Jan Ulee and Uhdoor Ruheem, of the Arabic Department of the College of Fort William.

IN THE PRESS.

CLASSICAL.

A complete edition of Demosthenes is in the press; the best translations will be given, together with Reiske's *Apparatus Criticus*. It will form 3 or 4 vols. 8vo. and will be the only complete edition on sale.

Catullus: with English Notes. By T. Forster, Esq. Jun. 12mo.

A neat Edition of the Septuagint, in One Volume Octavo; the Text is taken from the Oxford edition of Bos. It may be had in Two Vols. if preferred. Price 1l. 5s.

A new Edition of Homer's Iliad, from the text of Heyne; with English Notes at the end, including many from Heyne and Clarke. 1 vol. 8vo.

ORIENTAL.

A Grammar of the Kurnata Language, by the Rev. Dr. William Carey.

At Bombay, the Dusateer, with the ancient Persian Translations, and Commentary; and a Glossary of the Ancient Persian Words; by Moolla Feerooz Bin Moolla Kuus; to which will be added an English translation. The Dusateer is one of the most singular books that have appeared in the East. It professes to be a collection of the writings of the different Persian prophets, from the time of Muhabad, to the time of the Fifth Sasan, being fifteen in number, of whom Zuratoosht, whom, following the Greeks, we call Zorooaster, was the thirteenth, and the Fifth Sasan the last. This Sasan lived in the time of Khoosro Purveez, who was contemporary with the Emperor Heraclius, and died only nine years before the destruction of the ancient Persian monarchy. The writings of these fifteen Prophets are in a tongue of

which no other vestige appears to remain, and which would have been unintelligible, without the assistance of the ancient Persian translation. It is quite a different language from the Zhound, Puhluvee, and the Duree, the most celebrated of the dialects of Ancient Persia. The Persian translation professes to have been made by the fifth Sasan, who has added a Commentary, in which some difficulties of the original text are expounded.

This work, though known to have existed as late as the time of Shah Juhan, had eluded the search of the curious in Oriental History and Antiquities in latter times. The Copy from which the present edition will be published, was discovered by the Editor at Ispahan, about forty-four years ago, when travelling in Persia, for the purpose of making some investigations regarding the history of the early Persians, and particularly in search of materials for settling the disputes which prevailed among the Parsees of India, regarding the ancient Persian months, the differences of opinion respecting which had produced a schism at Surat. The editor is not aware of the existence of any other copy of this work. It is however cited by Buhram Furhad, the author of the Sharistani Char-Chumun, who lived in the age of the Emperor Ukbur and of his son Juhangeer. Indeed Buhram Furhad, who was a Parsee, followed the doctrines of the Dusateer. It is often cited by Hukeem Ibni Khuluhfoot-Tubreeze Moohummud Hoosuer, the author of the Boorhani Qatiu, the most perfect and best dictionary extant of the Persian language, who lived in the age of Shah Juhan, and who often quotes the Dusateer, as his authority for words in the old Persian. Moohummud Moohsin, who seems to have been the author of the celebrated work, entitled the Dubistan, which contains the history of the different religions of Asia, takes the Dusateer as his guide in the account which he gives of the ancient Persian religion, and it is remarkable, that Sir William Jones, who had never met with the Dusateer, appears to have been singularly struck with the details borrowed from it, and, in his sixth discourse, speaks of them as wonderfully curious, and as throwing a new light on the history of ancient times.

In the Dubistan the Dusateer is thus mentioned:—"God revealed to Muhabad a book called Dusateer, in which were taught every language and science: it was divided into many parts, there being several volumes for every language; and therein was a particular language, bearing no resemblance to any tongue spoken in this lower world, and it was called the heavenly speech. Muhabad gave a distinct language to every tribe, whom he sent to settle in such places as were best suited to each; and from thence have arisen the Persian, Hindoo, Greek and other tongues."

The editor has bestowed many years of his life in the search of such monuments as can illustrate the history, language and opinions of the ancient Persians, his ancestors. He has from a long familiarity with the style of the work, and with the chain of philosophical doctrines which it contains, been able, as he hopes, to correct many of

the errors of the text, and to illustrate several of the peculiar opinions in the work. The Glossary is the labourof many years, and of very extensive reading, and can hardly fail to be acceptable to those who make the language of Persia their study.

An English translation and preface will accompany the work, which will be published in two volumes octavo.

NOTES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Having inserted the FABLES of PHÆDRUS lately discovered in the Ambrosian Library by ANGELUS MAIUS, we shall in our next give the *Fragments of the three Orations of Cicero*, discovered by the same.

We shall have much pleasure in recording Professor DUNBAR'S Dissertation on the particle ἄν.

We shall in our next continue Professor GAIL'S articles.

Mr. W.'s Miscellaneous Observations will certainly appear in No. XXX. We shall hope for a continuation.

W. S. T. in our next.

The conclusion of the Obss. on Bentley's Notes to Aristophanes is necessarily delayed.

We have not room to notice several valuable articles lately received.

CONTENTS OF NO. XXX.

	PAGE.
Hebrew Criticisms	189
On the Demon of SOCRATES	205
Longevity of Men of Letters	207
On the Style of the Ancient Greek Epigram	212
E. H. BARKERI Epistola Critica ad TH. GAISFORDIUM, de Fragmentis Poetarum Minorum Gr. Pars Quinta	216
Bibliography	220
On the Sapphic and Alcaic Metres, No. III.	221
Gryphiadæa—Carmen Venatorium; in Greek Hexameters	237
De l'Improvisation Poetique chez les Anciens, et particulièrement chez les Grecs et chez les Romains. Par M. RAOUL-ROCHETTE	249
Some observations on the Worship of Vesta, and the Holy Fire, in Ancient Rome: with an account of the Vestal Virgins. Part II. By G. H. NOEHDEN, LL.D.	257
The Shipwreck of St. Paul; a Seatonian Prize Poem	269
Instance of Arabian Forgery	279
De Carminibus Aristophanis Commentarius. Pars IV.	286
Collatio Codicis Harleiani 5674, cum Odyssea Editionis Ernestinæ, 1760	292
Miscellanea Classica	296
On the Originality of KUSTER's Discovery about the true force of the Middle Verb	304
Additional Remarks on the Extracts from ARCADIUS Grammaticus, MS.	310
Translation from TIMOCREON	313
Greek Sapphic Ode	315

PAGE.

Greek and Latin Epigrams 317
Vindication of the Translation of ARRIAN's Periplus of the Euxine Sea ..... ib.
An account of Researches made among the Ruins of Pompeii, in 1813 320
A Critical Examination of certain modern opinions respecting the Troad, and the descriptions of Homer; and an inquiry into the authorities on which they have been founded. By C. H. PARRY, M. D., F. R. S., &c. .. 326
Mohammedes. Carmen præmio dignatum in Coll. Æd. Chr. Oxon. 1787. 344
On the derivation of Antea, Antehac, Postea, Posthac, Posteaquam, Interea, &c. 346
J. STACKHOUSII Emendationes in ÆLIANUM Hist. Anim. No. III. 359
Curæ Posteriores 361
ADVERSARIA LITERARIA. No. XII.—An quicquid recipiatur, ad modum recipientis recipiatur? Affirmatur.—An detur in rerum natura absoluta quies? Negatur.—An aliquid violentum sit diuturnum? Negatur.—An quidquid recipitur ad modum recipientis, recipiatur? Affirmatur.—Admonita locorum.—Latin Ode.—Translation from Vincent Bourne.—Carmina Quadragesimalia.—Latin Epigram.—Gr. Lines of Jos. Scaliger.—Epitaph on Viglius in the Cathedral of Ghent.—Reply of Scævola.—Latin distich.—Do.—Conjecture on Tweddell's Epigram.—Emendation of Livy.—Trial by Ordeal.—In Sophoclis Ajacem Emendd.—Remarks on some Passages in Diodorus Sic. 362
Encore Quelques Mots sur l'Inscription de la Colonne de Diocletien à Alexandrie 374
Greek Letter of BENNET LANGTON 375
Literary Intelligence 376
Notes to Correspondents 386

THE

CLASSICAL JOURNAL,

NO. XXX.

FOR JUNE, 1817.

HEBREW CRITICISMS.

To the Editor of the Classical Journal.

Having lately read a new translation of the canonical book, commonly known by the title of, *The Song of Solomon*, I have been induced to compare it with the authorized version, and with the original Hebrew; and the result has produced the following observations, which may prove not unacceptable to some of your readers. I believe that few, even of the learned (if I may judge from the expositions that have been offered of this interesting and divine book) are aware that, in the original, it does not present any of those sensual ideas, which have not only been admitted, but have been made its very foundation, the materials of the superstructure, and the corner-stone of the building. An attempt, therefore, to show what was the real intention of the sacred writer, what the real matter, and what the final aim of the book, cannot, it is hoped, prove unacceptable. It is not, however, my intention at present to offer a complete translation of the book, until my new translation of the Bible shall appear. But it may be satisfactory to serious Christians, to have enough of its general scope laid before them, to satisfy them that the Hebrew original gives no sanction whatever to those gross ideas, which have afforded a subject of mirth to the libertine.

That a translator, who takes the letter of the original, as agreeing generally with the sense conveyed in the vulgar version, as *a romance*, "in a historical or pastoral form," should fail in understanding the subject of the writer, or in answering and obviating the objections with great propriety brought against this book, as it now stands in all the versions, will excite no surprize, except in those who are young in Hebrew literature. This book, ever since the time of the first translators, has been understood to be founded on an intercourse between two young persons of different sexes, by which we have been told, is represented the spiritual communication between Christ and the church. That this book has a relation to a spiritual communication from God to the church, in the way which he had ordained from the beginning, by the cherubim from the mercy-seat in the Holy of Holies, is certain; but it is not true that it has the most distant allusion to the sensual views which are given in all the vulgar versions. It must at all times have been painful to Christians to have seen so formidable a weapon in the hands of those who never fail to illustrate their particular views in order to ridicule this book, by quotations from the authorized version; and which, in this sense, are not palliated, but rendered more sensual by the fanciful suppositions of translators and commentators.

It has been supposed that this book was written by Solomon; but I shall have occasion to show, that it was a book of great antiquity in his day, and which is referred to in the Psalms by the words "*dark sayings of old.*" It is possible that Solomon collected and incorporated the materials of this book, as David did other sacred songs of prophecy and praise, which were in use in the church before his time; but the truth is, that the idea of his being the author of this *song of songs*, has never had any better foundation than the mistranslation of the word לִשְׁלֹמֹה *lishlomoh*, which occurs in the first verse; and which is applied to Solomon. Hence all the error which has for ages been received, respecting allusions to the marriage of Solomon with the daughter of Pharaoh.

It is a well-known fact that the translation from which the Vulgate was made, and from which all the European translations have had their origin, is very defective. For the Hebrew language was in the hands of the Jews only, till Jerome and some of the fathers his contemporaries had made a little progress in acquiring it. But it appears that the knowledge they obtained was not such as to enable them to give the meaning of the writer in this book.

Objectors, therefore, judging from these translations only, have supposed that they are perfect copies of the Hebrew, and have thus presumed to represent the contents of this book, as the language of the original; which, as must be evident to every reflecting reader, is altogether opposed to the holiness and dignity of the divine communicator, who gave it from the mercy-seat between the cherubim.

It is allowed that the sense given in the translations from which the European translations are made, conveys nothing to us by which

its sanctity can be ascertained; on the other hand, it is only calculated to open the mouth of infidelity, to assist in calumniating the scriptures; but at the same time it may be affirmed, without the fear of contradiction, that nothing of the nature alluded to in the present translations, is to be found in the original Hebrew.

In order therefore to show that this book does not contain any thing of the sensual nature alluded to in the translation, but that it exhibits a series of divine allegories, which, agreeably to the ancient dispensation under which they were given, were applied to signify the perfect state of the true church of God, in opposition to idolatry, I shall call the attention of the reader to the translation of other passages in this book. First, giving the erroneous translation as it is handed down to us, and secondly, the true translation from the Hebrew, confirmed by other passages in the original, where the same words occur, which can have no other meaning or application, and which will necessarily be allowed by the learned in all nations, to be conclusive proof, that the new translation is correct; for it puts the opinion of man entirely out of the question, by suffering the scriptures alone to determine the true meaning and application, agreeably to the understanding of the ancient Hebrews.

In the viii. chapter, and the 11th and 12th verses, we have in the translation, a sense given altogether inconsistent with the original: it is as follows: *Solomon had a vineyard at Baal-hamon, he let out the vineyard unto keepers: every one for the fruit thereof was to bring a thousand pieces of silver. My vineyard which is mine, is before me: thou, O Solomon, must have a thousand, and those that keep the fruit thereof, two hundred.* But alas, if any transaction of this nature had literally taken place, that Solomon had placed this black beauty in a garden at *Baal-hamon*, which brought him in for rent *a thousand of silver*, and the dressers or keepers of the vines had two hundred for keeping it in order, which commentators in all ages, since the time of the first translators who made these blunders, have supposed;—is it to be imagined that the Holy Spirit would have made such trifles the subject of communication to the church? None who will bestow due attention to make themselves acquainted with the sacred nature of the subjects contained in this most ancient of all the sacred books, will believe this to have been possible.

It could be of no importance for posterity to know, that the king of Israel had a garden at *Baal-hamon*, which he let out to keepers, and that every one for the fruit of it was to bring a thousand of silver, and the keepers to receive two hundred for keeping it in order; any more than it is for posterity to be informed that the king of England has a garden at Kew, and that those who take care of it, and keep it in order, are paid for their trouble. Therefore something of a higher and of a more interior nature must be signified, than is contained in the present translations of this allegorical book. But it must be of the utmost consequence for the present generation, and for posterity to know, that the whole of this ancient book is a prophecy

concerning the true Messiah, the Prince of Peace, as the end of all sacrifices; and that it has no reference, as translators and commentators have supposed, to the wife of Solomon, who they say was presented with this estate by him for her residence. And yet, strange to tell, Solomon had let it out to tenants! *every one who enjoyed the fruit thereof, was to pay a thousand a year.*

We cannot have a more convincing proof of a want of discernment as to the meaning contained in the letter of this book. Whence do we learn that this is a sacred book, if such trifling subjects as are presented in the translations be not only allowed by commentators, but rendered still more objectionable to the intelligent reader, by the additional sensual views, with which they have indulged in fanciful interpretation?

Can any thing more trifling, more absurd be produced in the Soph of the Persians, the Veda of the Bramins, the legends of the Koran, or the tales of the Talmud? By such interpretations and admissions, infidels are more confirmed in their sensual views concerning the contents of this book. Therefore, unless the translators and commentators could have shown us, that nothing of this nature is contained in its pages, they ought not to have laid their thoughts before the public. Christianity has gained nothing, but on the contrary has suffered by their labors. Within a few years, five different translations have been ushered into the world; but all inconsistent with the meaning and intention of the sacred writer.

The words בַּעַל הָמוֹן *Baal-hamon,* have been transferred untranslated into all the versions as the name of the place where this garden is said to have been. The word הָמוֹן *hamon,* comes from the root מון *mon,* which root and its derivatives mean *likeness.* Exod. xxi. 4. *likeness.* Deut. v. 8.—ch. iv. 15. *similitude.* Job iv. 26. *image.* Numb. xii. 8. Psalm xvii. 15. And the word בַּעַל *Bagnal,* means *Lord:* the passage will then truly read agreeably to the literal import of the words, consequently with the meaning of the inspired writer; the syntax is much the same in Hebrew as it is in English, except the verb which precedes the noun; it reads thus: A VINEYARD THERE WAS CONCERNING PEACE, BY THE LORD OF THE SIMILITUDE GIVEN TO THE VINEYARD-KEEPERS. There can be no hesitation in concluding, that the *vineyard* here spoken of means the church, for this is its meaning throughout the scriptures: Isaiah v. 7. *For the vineyard of the Lord of Hosts is the House of Israel, and the men of Judah his pleasant plant.* And as a vineyard was used by the sacred writers to mean a church figuratively, so the vineyard-keepers or vine-dressers meant those who officiated in sacred things: Christ says, *I am the true vine, my father is the husbandman.* From this consideration it must appear to the intelligent as well as to the learned reader, that by the *thousand pieces of silver* given to the Lord of the vineyard, and *two hundred* or a fifth for the *vineyard-keepers* or vine-dressers, was always understood that part of the produce of the land which was given to defray

the expense of the public worship. This was a very ancient custom before the time of Moses. Gen. xlvii. 26. *And Joseph made it a law over the land of Egypt unto this day, that Pharaoh should have the fifth part, except the land of the priests only.* Lev. v. 16. *and shall add the fifth part thereto, and give it unto the priest*—ch. xxii. 14. —xxvii. 15. ver. 27. 31. The fifth part was the number of the fine for restitution, when any thing which had been devoted to the service of the temple was redeemed: this fifth was then put into the treasury to defray the expence of public worship, as was the case in the time when this book was written. Now as in this church every thing was representative, *likenesses* and *similitudes* were given, not only as applicable to the true worshippers of God, whose lives were formed agreeably to his commandments; but primarily to represent and point to Christ, the end of all sacrifices. Hence it is said בְּבַעַל הֲמוֹן *bebaal-hamon, by the Lord of the similitude*, referring to the Messiah as the Lord of the church, of whom it is said by the prophet, *I have used similitudes by the ministry of the prophets.*

It may seem strange to some, that the church should be compared to a garden; but in the original language it is familiar and natural. It was so called in the days of our Lord, and is used in the New Testament. The allegorical application is very striking; for, as a garden which in its original state was unproductive, compared with common grounds is expected to be in a high state of cultivation, and also shows the wisdom and industry of man; so it was used emblematically to represent the man of the church, who by applying his heart to true wisdom, formed his life agreeably to the precepts and doctrines of the scripture; but whose life in his natural state was in opposition to every good thought, word, and action.

From the above translations, confirmed by the same words in other parts of scripture which can have no other meaning nor application, it must appear evident that this book is altogether allegorical and prophetic, and has no relation to the circumstances of carnal marriage between Solomon and Pharaoh's daughter, as has been supposed for many ages, or between Solomon and a negro, but contains a description of the most perfect state of the ancient church, which was to be manifested or restored spiritually by Christ, consistently with those types and allegories which pointed to him who is the Lord of the vineyard.

Some translators divide the book into twelve parts, which *they* call Idyls, from the Greek word εἰδύλλιον, signifying a short poem. I cannot find any thing like poetry in the book, in *their sense* of that term. I shall take notice of a few particulars in what these writers call the dialogue between the bride and the daughters of Jerusalem, ch. i. 5.

Bride. "*I am black*——
Virgins. —*Yet most beautiful*——
Bride. O daughters of Jerusalem—as the tents of Kedar—
Virgins. As the hangings of the curtains of Solomon."

There is nothing in this book written in the dramatic style, as many commentators have supposed. The words שְׁחוֹרָה אֲנִי *Shechorah ani*, are rendered in all the translations, *I am black;* a modern author says, she was "brown and tawny:" and in order to reconcile us to this brown beauty, he informs us, that "the Arabians, who are descended from Ishmael by *Kedar*, have their tents (which have a black or brown appearance) made of goat's or camel's hair. "It is to these that the bride compares the complexion of her sun-burnt skin." We need not wonder that any writer should be unfortunate in his comparisons when writing on this book, if he does not attend to the true meaning of the original. There can be no great beauty in *black tents:* it is very improper indeed, to compare a woman for her beauty to *black tents;* there is no harmony or agreement in the comparison. Besides, the answer of the virgins, on this supposition, must prove that the curtains of the pavilion of Solomon were black also: a very unfit color for the pavilion of a king; *I am black—as the tents of Kedar—as the curtains of the pavilion of Solomon.* Hence it must appear, that no such reference was made either to the *tents of Kedar*, or to the *curtains of Solomon.*

I am black.—These writers say, "the bride speaks thus as if abashed at their flattering commendations, conscious of her own defect in point of beauty." This no way corresponds to other parts; for the same person is said to be the FAIREST among women, her neck is compared to ivory for whiteness, and her lips to scarlet: from which again it must be allowed that the ground of these allegories has not been apprehended, either by the translators or commentators.

I have compared thee, my partner, to the horse in the chariots of Pharaoh: it is very improper undoubtedly, to compare a beautiful woman to the horses in the chariots of Pharaoh! When we read: *let him eat among the flowers—feed among the lilies—on my bed at night I sought the beloved of my soul, I sought him, but could not find him—hair like a flock of goats—eyes like the pool of Heshbon—breasts like two young roes—or a nose like the tower of Lebanon—neck like as a tower of ivory—head like Carmel—hair of the head like purple—belly like an heap of wheat—I am a wall, &c.* Language like this can have neither meaning nor application on the external ground which commentators have taken. We must necessarily look for a translation consistent with rational ideas, which are the same in all ages and in all nations; a translation bearing some degree of similarity as to the things which are compared with each other: but which has certainly been most eminently mistaken by translators and expositors.

The word שְׁחוֹרָה *Shechorah*, and שְׁחוֹר *Shechor*, have been in the Bible translated *black, blackness,* but very improperly. It has an opposite signification, and means the appearance of the dawn, when the sun enters the first degree of the twilight circle; and thus it was always used by the ancient Hebrews, Job xxxviii. 12. שַׁחַר the *day-*

spring. Amos iv. 13. שַׁחַר *the morning*. Job iii. 9. שָׁחַר *the dawning of the day*. Gen. xxxii. 26. הַשַּׁחַר *the day breaketh*. Joel ii. 2. כְּשַׁחַר *as the light spreadeth upon the mountains*. It is figuratively applied to the *dawn* of understanding, Isaiah viii. 20. שָׁחַר *no light in them*.—ch. xlvii. 11. שַׁחְרָהּ *from whence it ariseth*.—lviii. 8. כַּשַּׁחַר *as the morning*. Psalm cx. 3. מִשְׁחָר *of the morning*: but the translators have erroneously applied it to the darkness in the west, which yet prevails at the first appearance of the dawn. From which it is evident, that the translators have mistaken the meaning and application of the words, which should not have been rendered, *I am black*, but שְׁחוֹרָה אֲנִי I AM THE DAWNING LIGHT.

The next word in this verse is וְנָאוָה *venaavah*, which is in the Bible translated, *comely*. If we were to understand it to refer to a female, the word *comely* can but with a bad grace be applied to a negro, as is supposed by some commentators. This word comes from the radix נָוֶה *Naeh*, which means a *fixed* or *settled habitation, folds*, or *pastures*. 2 Sam. xv. 25. נָוֵהוּ *his habitation*. Psa. lxxix. 7. בְּנָאוֹת xxiii. 2. *in pastures*. Jer. ix. 10. נְאוֹת ch. xxv. 37. *habitations*. It is connected with the noun בְּנוֹת *benoth, daughters*, and reads וְנָאוָה בְּנוֹת *when the habitation of the daughters*.

קֵדָר *Keedaar*, is the next word which requires attention. It is not translated: instead of which, the Hebrew pronunciation is retained in the English Bible, and in all other translations, for what reason is not necessary to say. I shall endeavour to illustrate this passage by giving a true translation of the word קֵדָר *keedaar*, and in order that it may have a due effect, I shall here make a short digression by giving the translation of this word where the translators have not translated it, but have retained the Hebrew pronunciation in English; in Isaiah xlii. 11. and in Jer. viii. 21. where they have greatly erred in their attempt to translate it. This will afford us an opportunity of removing a very serious objection to this passage, and of hearing the truth as it was spoken and written by the prophet.

The first passage where the word קֵדָר *keedaar*, occurs, not translated, but where the Hebrew pronunciation is retained as in the above passage in Canticles, is in Isaiah xlii. 11. *Let the wilderness and the cities thereof lift up their voice, the villages that* קֵדָר *keedaar doth inhabit, let the inhabitants of the rock sing, let them shout from the top of the mountains.*

The true meaning of the word קֵדָר *keedaar*, is *to mourn*, to be in a disturbed state of mind. Job v. 11. וְקֹדְרִים *those which mourn*. Ch. xxx. 28. קֹדֵר הִלַּכְתִּי *I went mourning*. Psalm xxxviii. 6.

כָּל הַיּוֹם קֹדֵר הִלָּכְתִּי *I go mourning all the day.*—xlii. 9. *I go mourning.*—xliii. 2. *why go I mourning?* The beauty of this passage in Isaiah is lost; it is unintelligible, as the word קֵדָר *keedaar*, is not translated. But when it is translated, it appears plain that the meaning is *to mourn;* for the prophet uses it in that sense. He calls on those who inhabit the villages of קֵדָר *keedaar*, or the *villages of* MOURNING, to rejoice, in the following clause, viz. *the villages that the* MOURNERS *inhabit, let the inhabitants of the rock sing.* From which it is certain that the word קֵדָר *keedaar*, can have no other meaning.

The next is in Jer. viii. 21. where the translators have translated the word קָדַרְתִּי *I am black. For the hurt of the daughter of my people, am I hurt.* קָדַרְתִּי I AM BLACK. But this is evidently wrong: the verb is the first person singular preter in Kal, and should be rendered, *I have mourned.* Which is then in agreement with the former part of the verse, as the prophet had mourned, because on account of the hurt of the daughter of his people, he was hurt. So that the translators have not only mistaken the *tense* of the verb, but its obvious meaning also; as it is absurd to suppose that the prophet was *black*, on account of the hurt of the daughter of his people. By the word *daughter* is meant the church, as the *daughter of Zion*, and in the passage under consideration "*daughters of Jerusalem.*" Psalm xlviii. 11. *let mount Zion rejoice, let the daughters of Judah be glad.* Isaiah iii. 16. *Because the daughters of Zion are haughty.*—ch. iv. 4. *when the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion.*

כְּאָהֳלֵי קֵדָר *keahalee keedaar*, in Canticles, then reads thus, *like the tabernacles of mourning.*

כִּירִיעוֹת שְׁלֹמֹה *kirignoth shelomoh*, is by some translated, "like the hangings of the pavilion of Solomon." But no word for *pavilion* is to be found in the Hebrew, and we gain nothing by changing *curtains* for *hangings*, as above. So far the received translation is preferable. But this word, as Dr. Taylor justly observes, "is most obviously deduced from רֵעָה *raagnaah, a friend, neighbour, companion.*" Job xxv. 4. רֵעֶיךָ *thy companions.* Ezek. xxii. 12. *thy neighbours.* רֵעָיו *his friends.* Job xxxii. 3. רֵעֶיהָ *her friends.* Lam. i. 2. וְרֵעַי *my fellows.* Jud. xi. 37.

שְׁלֹמֹה *shelomoh*, signifies *peace*, that which is *complete, perfect, finished*, it has the ה *ha*, postfixed, is emphatic, and means *peace* in a superlative degree; which was the reason that this name from this ancient book was given to Solomon by David, who was informed by divine communication, that in his reign the church and the nation were to enjoy universal peace. The whole verse truly reads thus:

I AM THE DAWNING LIGHT, AS THE COMPANION OF PEACE: WHEN THE HABITATION OF THE DAUGHTERS OF JERUSALEM IS AS THE TABERNACLES OF MOURNING. Agreeably to the English idiom, כִּירִיעוֹת שְׁלֹמֹה *kirignoth shelomoh*, is better to follow שְׁחוֹרָה אֲנִי *shekhorah ani*, but in Hebrew it finishes the verse, and indeed it might be so understood in our language.

Thus it appears, that this is a prophetic book, in which is shown the communication of the Holy Spirit with the church; and though the above translation of this verse stands opposed to that of the received one, yet from the proofs above given, it must be allowed that this was the meaning of the inspired writer, and that it has no relation to those views which have been given by the first translators, when the Hebrew language was not understood by Christians, in the early ages of the church.

In the vii. chapter, ver. 2., the first clause הַמִּזֶּג שָׁרְרֵךְ אַגַּן הַסַּהַר אַל יֶחְסַר is translated, *Thy navel is like a round goblet that wanteth not liquor*. It is not easy to ascertain on what ground the translators made so strange a comparison. שָׁרְרֵךְ *shaarreeke*, I suppose, has been understood by them to mean the *navel*, because where mention is made of the Behemoth, it is said, *his force* בִּשְׁרִירֵי בִטְנוֹ *is in the navel of his belly*. It must appear evident that of all the parts of the body of an animal, the navel is the least calculated to be the center of force or strength. The learned have concluded that the hippopotamus was here understood by Job; which is provided with a thick coat that extends from his loins to the extremity of his belly, so hard that there is scarcely a possibility of penetrating it with the point of the bayonet; yet his strength is not in his navel, but in the thick coat which, hanging from his *loins*, defends his belly. Therefore the word בִּשְׁרִירֵי *bishrirce*, ought to have been rendered by *armour, harness, breastplate*. See 1 Kings xxii. 34. הַשִּׁרְיָן *the harness*. Isaiah lix. 17. כַּשִּׁרְיָן *as a breastplate*. This passage in Job then reads, *his strength is in his loins, and his force within his harness*. That is, because the animal is protected by this impenetrable covering, he uses his great strength, which is under or within it in the loins, without fear, by which his force, when he attacks the larger animals, is irresistible.

There is another passage where this word has been translated navel. Prov. iii. 8. *It shall be health* לִשְׁרֶךָ *to thy navel*. But it must appear improper to the thinking reader. We never hear of the sickness of the navel, and as human nature was the same in old time as it is now, it must be plain that this cannot be the true meaning of the word. The word רְפָאוֹת *riphaouth*, a noun feminine plural, cannot be translated by *health*. See Jer. xxx. 13. where this word is truly

translated by *medicines;* which are as necessary to defend and keep the body in health, as harness or armour is to defend it from external injury: *thou hast no healing* רְפָאוֹת *medicines.*

This clause in Proverbs will then read in agreement with the three preceding verses, which speak of *acknowledging*, *trusting*, and *fearing* God, thus, *It shall be medicine* לִשְׁרֶךָ *to defend thee.* That is, the acknowledgment and fear of God shall keep the mind secure, as armour defends the body from injury, and as medicines restore it from sickness. Hence it must appear, that this word in Canticles, should be translated in conformity with the same words in the above places, which can have no other meaning: thus, *thy strength*, or *thy defence.*

The following word אַגַּן *aggan*, is translated, *a round goblet.* But it must be plain that such an excrescence would be a defect and not a perfection, as it is represented in the translation; therefore this cannot be the true reading. The primary sense of this word relates to any thing circular, as an *arched building*, a *bason*, a *circular* ditch, in Chaldee, Targum Jon., Jud. iv. 11., Isaiah lxv. 11. In the Jerusalem Targum it means the circle of the moon. And in this passage in Canticles, it must necessarily be translated consistently with its primitive meaning, a *circle.*

The vii. chapter opens with the same vein of error and inconsistency in the translations. *How beautiful are thy feet with shoes! O prince's daughter! the joints of thy thighs are like jewels, the work of the hands of a cunning workman.* But it is surprising that the translators, and commentator after commentator, should translate מַה־יָּפוּ פְעָמַיִךְ בַּנְּעָלִים *how beautiful are thy feet in shoes*, and this as applied to a princess. No such meaning nor application is sanctioned by the original; nay it is impossible to suppose any thing more opposite to truth, than the present translation is to the true sense of the passage. The sacred writer shows the beauty of the true worship of God, when the Hebrews *dwelt* in the wilderness, and *offered* their sacrifices with a sincere heart. But the translation describes a beautiful young woman, the daughter of a prince, in such a manner as makes us blush to call it a sacred book. Besides, there ought to be some correspondence or conformity between the things compared; but there is no agreement between THIGHS and JEWELS, *the work of the hands of a cunning workman.*

The whole Israelitish church, when God gave the law and the ceremonies, is here called בַּת־נָדִיב *daughter of a prince.* This has led the translators to suppose that it referred to the wife of Solomon, and many commentators, ever since the dispersion of the Jews, have indulged themselves in strange whimsies and interpretations, disgracing the sublime truths of this book, by making it the sport of infidels. But the translators should have recollected that Abraham was the father of the Jewish nation, that the promise was to his posterity,

that on the defection of Esau who was an idolater,[1] Jacob was chosen to be the visible head of the church, and that in the contention, when Jacob contended with the messenger, Gen. xxxii. *he said, thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but* ISRAEL: *for as* A PRINCE *hast thou power with God, and with men, and hast prevailed.* The word יִשְׂרָאֵל *Israel* is a compound from שַׂר *Saar*, a *prince*, and אֵל *Eel*, God, i. e. *a prince of God.* נָדִיב *naadib*, also means a *prince*, or *ruler*, but as the writer addresses the church descended from Jacob, he says בַּת־נָדִיב *daughter of a prince*: for *daughter* is a common name given to the church in various parts of scripture, as above.

Therefore it is the same whether the writer had said, *daughter of a prince*, or *daughter of Israel*: they both signify the congregated body of the true church of God, in opposition to the idolatrous worshippers of the time. Hence it is evident, that had the translators and commentators understood the passage, they would not have applied it to mean a young woman, with all those descriptions which modesty covers with the mantle of darkness.

I shall now examine two words in the first proposition of this important verse: פְּעָמַיִךְ *phegnamayikc*, is rendered *thy feet*. But this word should have been translated as the same word is in Psalm cxl. 4. פְּעָמָי *my goings*, or *my goings forth*; with this difference, that it has the ך *caph* postfixed, which represents the second person; the other has י *yod*, which means the pronoun of the first person possessive. It would then read, *were thy goings forth.*

בַּנְּעָלִים *Bangnaalim*, is in the translation rendered *shoes*, viz. *How beautiful are thy feet in shoes.* But this might have been said of any other woman's feet in shoes, as well as of the supposed wife of Solomon. Therefore it must appear from so unimportant a translation, that something of a more important nature is comprehended in the Hebrew pages.

I wish here to caution the reader, not to suppose that because Hebrew words have a diversity of application, there is the least uncertainty in the language, as some have thought. In all languages words have different modes of expression and application; the word *stand* can be expressed by above 60 different modes of expression; and the word *set*, by upwards of 70: but because the word *stand*, is also meant by *halt*, and *set*, the preterite of *sit*, by the verb *plant*; no person would be justified in saying that the English language, for this reason, is altogether uncertain in its meaning and application.

Every Hebrew scholar knows that the language is as certain in its meaning and application, as any other language whatever: otherwise if God had given the scriptures in a language which admitted of a double meaning, man might justly say, I am not to blame for trans-

---

[1] See "History of all Religions."

gressing the law, as this or that word has another meaning, or a variety of meanings. Every Hebrew scholar knows, that every word which is the same in its radix and orthography, has the same meaning; and where the same radix differs as to orthography, it necessarily has a different meaning and application. The word נָחָשׁ *naachaash*, means a *serpent*, Gen. xlix. 17. but נַחֵשׁ *nachcesh*, which is the same in its radix and differing only as to its orthography, means, to *divine*, Gen. xliv. 5.—דֹּבֵר *dobeer*, to *speak*, and דֶּבֶר *deber*, a *pestilence*, and so of others. Indeed, those who neglect the Hebrew vowels, can never know the true meaning of the original scripture. It is the same in all languages; we should not know what to make of the letters b—ll, whether they meant *ball, bell, bill, boll*, or *bull*; or whether h—r meant *her, hare, heir, hair, here, hire, hoar, hour, hear.*

בַּנְעָלִים *Bangnaalim*, is in the translation rendered *shoes*, for no other reason but because פְּעָמַיִךְ *phegnaamaayike*, was translated to mean *feet*; and therefore the translators thought, that shoes must be a necessary appendage. The writer of this most ancient book by the word בַּנְעָלִים *bangnaalim*, refers to the passage of the Hebrews through the red sea, Gen. xiv. 22. *And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground.* Therefore the word *bangnaalim*, which occurs also in Isaiah xi. 15. where it can have no other meaning than that which the translators were compelled to give it, should have been translated here so as to have conveyed a similar sense: *And the Lord shall utterly destroy the tongue of the Egyptian sea; and with his mighty wind shall he shake his hand over the river, and shall smite it in the seven streams, and make men go over* בַּנְּעָלִים DRYSHOD. And as the sacred writer was here speaking of the church, by the words בַּת־נָדִיב *daughter of the prince*, when the daughter of Israel, or the church, went forth from Egypt through the red sea, to offer sacrifices to God, as they were commanded, with one heart, and boldly persevered though pursued by the enemy; I translate the word בַּנְּעָלִים *with dry shoes*, in conformity to other parts of scripture where the same word written with the same vowels can have no other meaning. This is in perfect agreement with Jonathan, who wrote his great work near 2000 years since, when the Hebrew was a living language; and it must be allowed that he gave the true understanding of the ancient Hebrews, as handed down to that period in all their writings. He says, referring to their sacrifices, "How beautiful are the proceedings of Israel, going forth to sacrifice their different offerings." This also is the opinion of Aben Ezra, and all the learned doctors among the Jews.

The first proposition in the first verse of the seventh chapter of Canticles, will then have its true reading, viz. HOW BEAUTIFUL WERE THY GOINGS FORTH DRY-SHOD, O DAUGHTER OF THE PRINCE!

The second proposition, which finishes the verse, is thus translated; *the joints of thy thighs are like jewels, the work of the hands of a cunning workman.* Whatever has been advanced in different ages since the first Greek and Latin translations were made, in the early time of the Christian church, to recommend this reading as it stands in the English, and in all the translations, must in this enlightened age fail in producing a belief that such was the language of the inspired writer. There ought to be some harmony or agreement between the subjects compared, but there is no kind of agreement between *thighs* and *jewels the work of the hands of a cunning workman.* The passage refers to the divine communication with the ancient church, and to the establishment of the Israelites when God brought them out of Egypt. The first two words of this proposition are חֲמוּקֵי יְרֵכַיִךְ which are translated, *joints of the thighs,* חֲמוּקֵי *chammuke,* certainly can have no such meaning as *joints.* It signifies to *turn aside,* to *turn and wind about,* a *circuit,* to elude and escape a pursuer who wants to take and bring him back again, and thus it is applied in this verse to the coming of the Israelites out of Egypt. Jer. xxxi. 22. תִּתְחַמָּקִין *wilt thou go about.* Cant. v. 6. חָמַק *had withdrawn himself.*

Neither can the word יְרֵכַיִךְ *yereekayike,* which is translated *thighs,* have that signification. This word is applied to mean the extreme parts, the *sides,* the *borders,* the *coasts,* the *quarters* of a country, the *shaft* or *supporter* of any thing. Numb. viii. 4. *the shaft.* But the same word is rendered *thighs,* Numb. v. 27. which are the *shafts* or *supporters* of the body. When the word is used to signify local situations, as in the case before us, it is throughout the scriptures and the Rabbinical writings, translated *sides, borders, coasts,* or *quarters* of a country. Ezek. xxxviii. 6. *Togarmah of the north* יַרְכְּתֵי *quarters.* Gen. xlix. 13. וְיַרְכָתוֹ *and his border.* The *side,* Jud. xix. 18.—Isa. xiv. 13.

It will also be allowed that the word חֲלָאִים is applicable to ornaments of various kinds. See Prov. xxv. 12. וַחֲלִי *an ornament,* and as such, it is applied to mean jewels. But according to the construction and series of the narrative in the above place, it cannot be so applied, to mean the beauty of a woman, in such a way, when the scripture is the subject, as to shock the feelings of modesty.

There remain but two words to notice in this verse, for the first of which, though the translators have given a sense conformably to the radical meaning, a far more proper word might have been chosen, consistently with the construction of the passage. מַעֲשֵׂה *maegnaseeh,* is translated *the work,* and so the thighs of this person, in all the translations (following the errors of the first translator) are compared to *jewels,* THE WORK *of the hands of a cunning workman.* But its true meaning in this place is, in conformity with the whole narra

tive, *to offer* offerings. Numb. vi. 17. יַעֲשֶׂה *he shall offer.*—2 Kings v. 17. 2 Chron. iv. 6.

But the last word in this verse אָמָן cannot mean *a cunning workman.* This word, like other words in the Hebrew language has a variety of meanings and applications, all partaking of the nature of the root, but varying in their orthography, by which those applications are known. As אֶמַן *Eman, establish*—אֱמֶן *Eemun, faith*—אֹמֶן *Omen, truth*—אָמֵן *Aameen, so be it*—אוֹמֵן *Omeen, brought up*—אָמָן *Aamaan, faithful.* Had חשב—חכם—בין—ידע or their derivatives occurred, we might have allowed such a rendering, and even then but improperly, for we have no precedent for making compounds out of single words as is the case in the translation. But in no part of scripture is אָמָן *Aamaan,* translated *a cunning workman.* The whole verse in connexion will then read in conformity to that spirit of sanctity which dictated it, and which can only render it worthy of being called a sacred book:

How beautiful were thy goings forth dryshod, daughter of the prince, thy quarters went about, with ornaments, offerings of the hands of the faithful.

We also here have the meaning and application of the passage mentioned above, ch. i. 9. *I have compared thee, O my love, to a company of horses in Pharaoh's chariot.* Which refers to the passage of the Hebrews through the red sea, when they were pursued by the horses and chariots of Pharaoh.

The word דִּמִּיתִיךְ *dimitike,* is rendered, *I have compared thee.* The radix of this word means to be *silent,* to *rest,* to *cut off*—and so, to be cut off from an enemy. See Hos. iv. 6.—ch. x. 7. 15. Isa. vi. 5. *I am undone.* Heb. *I am cut off.* Jer. xlvii. 5.

רַעְיָתִי *ragnaati,* which is translated *O my love,* has no such meaning in any book in scripture: it is not the proper word for love, but uniformly means a friend or a neighbour.—לְסֵסָתַי *lesusaati,* is translated to *a company.* But there is no authority for the words *a company.* The clause reads: *I have cut off thee, my friend, from the horses and chariots of Pharaoh.*

בַּשּׁוֹשַׁנִּים *Bashoshanim,* has in all ages since the dispersion of the Jews, been taken, with a variation in its orthography, to mean *lilies,* but in no part of scripture, or in any of the Hebrew authors, is it or can it be translated *flowers,* as some translators render it. It would not have suited the intention of the sacred penman. The lily was used by the churches before the Israelitish church, by way of comparison to signify humility; it being a flower found in vallies, of a beautiful white; it grows low, on which account it was used representatively to mean *humility,* and its color *truth;* for *white* throughout the scriptures has this signification. See Isaiah i. 18. *though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as* WHITE *as snow.* Psalm li. 7. *wash me,*

and I shall be WHITER *than snow.* Dan. xii. 10. *Many shall be purified and made* WHITE. Matth. xxviii. 3. *his raiment* WHITE *as snow.* Rev. vii. 14. *and make them* WHITE *in the blood of the Lamb.* Thus it appears that the most ancient people, when they applied this color to the mind as a figure, understood it to mean *purity* of heart, *truth.* The effect of washing is to render garments *white,* and therefore it is used figuratively in scripture by the inspired writers, and applied to those who possessed similar qualities of the mind. Thus we find the allegory unfolded in the xlv. lxix. and lxxx. Psalms, where this word constitutes the title of each psalm. In the xlv. the eternal reign of Christ, and the happiness of the humble Christian are spoken of, and the glory of the church under the similitude of a virgin. In the lxix. the sufferings and humiliation of Christ are foretold, who was meek and lowly of heart: and the lxxx. shows the low and dependant state of the true church. From which it must be allowed that no flower would answer so well as the lily, by way of comparison, to describe the state of the true church or the humble Christian.

That the lily was applied figuratively by the churches before the Israelitish church, to mean humility, will appear by consulting scripture. At the building of the temple, which, as to the external ornaments, was representative in every part, *lilies* were resorted to as significative of humility. The molten sea, which was for the priests to wash in before they officiated at the altar, which washing was applied by them to signify uprightness of intention, was adorned on the brim or the highest part, *with flowers of lilies,* 2 Chron. iv. 5. Also, 1 Kings vii. 22. *and upon the tops of the pillars was lily-work.* Evidently meaning, that as pillars were the chief support of the temple, and lily-work, the emblem of humility, crowned the pillars; in like manner they understood that the great support and the highest perfection of true religion was *humility.* On this ground, the Holy Spirit communicating with the ancient church in the time of the patriarchs, concerning the coming of Christ the true Messiah, and describing him, says, Cant. ii. 1. *I am the rose of Sharon, and the lily of the vallies.* The church answers to this communication by saying, ch. vi. 3. *I am my beloved's, and my beloved is mine; he feedeth among the* LILIES. The allegory is consistent with other parts of scripture, where the humble state of the Christian is exalted above all others. Such as, *to that man will I look, even to him that is poor, and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word.—I dwell on the high and holy place; with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble.* The intention of the sacred writer in this part of the allegory, was to show how absolutely necessary it is for man to entertain humble thoughts concerning his qualifications for eternal happiness. And where the prophet Hosea is speaking of Christ and the man of the church, he uses the same phrase, ch. xiv. 5. *he shall grow as the lily,* viz. in humility. Hence it must appear, that the same word which is applied to Christ in

these psalms, was used by the original writer of the book of Canticles, to signify him under the figure of a lily.

Thus we find that this expressive figure communicated to posterity the *humility, purity, meekness,* and *lowliness of heart* of the true MESSIAH, the BLESSED REDEEMER.

In the 7th verse of the first chapter an enquiry is made by the church, or to use the language of some commentators, *where the beloved of her soul shall feed the flock.* The passage in the original is אִם־לֹא תֵּדְעִי לָךְ the literal translation of which is, *If not, thou shalt know for thyself.* Some commentators render it "if thou shalt not thyself perceive." The Bible translation, though not strictly accurate, is nearer the sense of the original, viz. *if thou know not;* notwithstanding the translators are blameable in leaving the word לָךְ *thyself,* unnoticed; for there no doubt is a material difference between a person's *knowing,* and knowing for *himself.* The Hebrew syntax is perfectly consistent with the English idiom, but some modern translators have thought proper to vary the order, by separating the second person from the verb, and to place it after the conjunction אִם *if*—the future before the negative לֹא—and the reciprocal pronoun לָךְ *thyself,* before the verb תֵּדְעִי *thou shalt know.* It is a violation of the rules of the language, and, like the vulgar version, it leaves the shepherd of the church, as giving no certain information, how or where his flock shall feed; whereas the original is clear and positive, the answer is as above, *if not, thou shalt know for thyself.* We have neither bride nor *shepherdess* in the original, but it is the answer of the Spirit of God to the church, agreeably to the order of the dispensation given before the time of Moses. This communication, as I have observed, was similar to that which was given at the establishment of the Israelitish church, by the Shechinah, i. e. the *Cherubim,* and the *Urim* and *Thummim.* For the original scriptures, when truly translated, inform us that these divine symbols, with the ARK and MERCY-SEAT, were given with the promise of the Redeemer, on man's transgression; and which were continued in the believing line of Seth, came down with the Hebrews into Egypt, and were brought with them at the Exodus, before that which was erected by Moses.

Were this plan of transposing words at pleasure admitted, without attending to the construction of the language, it would be possible to make the same words convey a different sense. I have made these remarks with a design to show, that we ought not to approve any new renderings, unless they be undeniably sanctioned by other parts of scripture, where such words can have no other meaning to make sense.

Having so far given proof consistently with the scripture, which should ever be its own interpreter, that this book contains nothing of that sensual cast found in the English, and in all the translations; I hope it will be allowed that I have not given my opinion only, but that I am confirmed in this view by those unerring oracles which can-

not be controverted; the literal meaning of the words in the original Hebrew, which meaning is shown to be such by the same words in other passages.

JOHN BELLAMY.

North Place, Gray's Inn Lane.

ON THE DEMON OF SOCRATES.

To the Editor of the Classical Journal.

A writer of great learning and genius has lately revived the notion, that Socrates actually affirmed that he had a spiritual monitor or demon, who gave him advice; and he introduces this supposed fact, in illustration of an argument of his own, respecting the Holy Spirit. The whole passage is this:

"Had Socrates, when speaking of that invisible Monitor, by whose dictates he professed to be guided, described it under the name of his prudence, his foresight, or his conscience, (though he might still have imputed to it the actions of a preceptor or of a friend) it would have then been clearly understood, that his language was metaphorical, and that by the imaginary personage of prudence, conscience, or foresight, he meant only to express a natural process of his intellectual faculties.

"But *when Socrates declared himself to have received advice and intelligence from a friendly demon,* his countrymen must have understood (and *he, doubtless, intended that they should so understand him*) that he was attended by one of those beings superior to man, whom, under the name of *demon,* they were accustomed from their infancy to fear, to propitiate, to adore." Heber's *Bampton Lectures, Lect.* II. *p.* 70.

Now, that Socrates never did make such an assertion, has been as fully proved, as such negative can be proved: and, what is remarkable, it is proved, in some measure, by the very passage quoted from Plato in the corresponding note. It contains words

attributed by Plato to Socrates himself, and they are these : *Τούτου δὲ αἴτιόν ἐστιν, ὃ ὑμεῖς ἐμοῦ πολλάκις ἀκηκόατε πολλαχοῦ λέγοντος, ὅτι μοι θεῖόν τι καὶ δαιμόνιον γίγνεται, φωνή.* κ. τ. λ.—which can only be rendered thus, " Now the cause of this is, what you have often heard me say, in various places, that something divine or supernatural happens to me, *which is, a voice.*" Or thus, " that a voice comes to me, which is something divine and preternatural."

It was not *a demon* then, but *a voice ;* nor was that voice attributed to any particular agent, but generally, to *the power of heaven.* That *θεῖον* and *δαιμόνιον* are both adjectives in this passage, is as clear as that *φωνὴ* is in apposition with *τι.* The passage of Plutarch is of no weight, since we know that the fiction of a demon had been invented and supported long before his time.

That Socrates himself never made any such assertion is here shown by Plato, and is yet more fully and clearly affirmed by Xenophon : and the whole question received an ample illustration in a tract published as long ago as in 1782, " On the Demon or Divination of Socrates ;" and republished in 1810, among Essays, &c. collected by me into two small volumes.

The argument therein maintained, in direct opposition to the assertion of Mr. Heber, received the positive assent of the late Dr. Enfield, of Dr. Hay, and indirectly that of Bishop Horsley, Mr. Mitford the historian, and Schweighæuser in his Opuscula Academica, part i. p. 153. Nor do I think that any learned man can attentively read the passage in Xenophon's Memoirs (or Memorabilia) of Socrates, where he vindicates his master from the accusation of introducing new gods, without seeing that he expressly denies the assertion of any *personal agent* or *monitor ;* ascribing the intimation, in a general way, to the power of heaven.

The great cause of error has been taking *δαιμόνιον,* in Plato and Xenophon,[1] for a substantive ; whereas it is exactly like *θεῖον,* which accompanies it, an adjective supported by *τι,* and thus signifying " something divine," or " something done by the power of heaven."

My motive for writing this to you is, that the very able author

[1] What others made of it is of no consequence.

of the Lectures may be induced hereafter to remove from his second discourse an illustration, which has, in fact, no bearing upon the point required to be illustrated; and therefore forms a blemish, where I would wish to see no imperfection.

This was intimated to the author, more than a year ago, in a private communication; but as such a notice may easily be forgotten, among studies and occupations of more importance, I wish also to record it in your pages. The intimation was, indeed, politely acknowledged; but as no communication has followed, either to give or withhold assent, Mr. H. will, I hope, consider this public notice as no less friendly than that sent in private, by your and his humble servant,

R. NARES.

LONGEVITY OF MEN OF LETTERS.

To the Editor of the Classical Journal.

In a literary circle, the conversation lately turned on the effects of study on the constitution; and it was affirmed that few men of learning had attained old age. This assertion was controverted by the writer of this article, who engaged, if he should succeed in establishing the truth of his opinion, to send you the result of his researches for insertion in the Classical Journal; should you think, with the company, that the subject falls within the limits of your plan.

You will observe that artists and physicians were not considered as intitled to a place in the list, unless they had distinguished themselves by literary productions. D. Y.

70. Arnaud. Bacchini. Basnage. Beveridge. Blacklock. Boerhave. Bourbon. Bradley. Cassius. D. Chardin. Cleobulus. Copernicus. Cujas. Darwin. Davenant. D'Herbelot. Dodwell. Dryden. Egnatius. Ennius. Erythreus. Eusebius. Fox, J. Fracastorio. Galen. Gesner, J. M. Gildus. Howell. Jungius. Leibnitz. Libanius. Livy. Maimonides. Mourgues. Newcome. Nicole, P. Nollet. Origen. Pagninus. Patin, Guy. Perrault. Petit. Petrarch. Pittacus. Priestley. Rabelais.

Rousseau, J. B. Selden. Socrates. Stephens, H. Tassoni. Theodoret. Tremellius, Vossius, J.

71. Addison, L. Andrews, Bp. Arias Montanus. Atterbury. Bardæus. Barthius. Bedell. Boccom. Bussieres. Campanelli. Cassini, Cæsar. Catullus. Cudworth. Dacier. Epiphanius. Estius. Golius. Gronovius. Gronovius, James. Harris. Linnæus. Lowth, W. Oxenstiern, Count. Pallas. Parker. Phædrus. Rabanus. Racine, L. Raulin. Redi. Sarpi, Paul. Tournely. Whitehead. Wotton, Sir H.

72. Amelot. Anaxagoras. Andreas, T. Aristarchus. Ayloffe. Bourdalone. Borelli. Burnet. Byrom. Camden. Casaubon, M. Chandler, R. Chaucer. Cheyne. Confucius. Costard. Cuper. Dubos. Ducarel. Epicurus. Eusebius. Farnaby. Godwin, J. Godwin, F. Hales, J. Harris. Henry, R. Jortin. Le Quien. Locke. Lopez de Vega. Malherbe. Marsigli. Mason. Meen, H. More, H. Papillon. Pennant. Politi. Prideaux. Reuchlin. Reyneau. Richardson. Robertson. Sabbathier, F. Sannazarius. Savile, Sir H. Sheffield. Shirley. Temple, Sir W. Toup. Trissino. Van der Putten. Vossius, G. J. Ward, Seth.

73. Abbadie. Ainsworth, R. Annesley, A. Earl of Anglesea. Barbeyrac, J. Bates, W. Baxter, W. Bonnet. Bray. Budæus. Bugenhagen. Buonamici. Burmann. Capperonier, C. Cary, R. Caylus, Count. Chandler. Crevier. Duppa. Flamstead. Gally. Glover. Hickes. Ihre. Le Beuf. Lightfoot. Mezerai. Mignot. Moore, J. Morin, J. B. Niccoli. Noris. Paleotti. Pavillon. Pothier. Potter, Archbp. Riccioli. Scioppius. Sorbonne, R. de. Trublet. Whitaker, J.

74. Afer. Amory. Aretino. Barclay, A. Bartolocci. Beccaria, C. Boileau. Boissard. Bouhours. Briggs. Cleaver, Bp. W. Destouches. Drelincourt. Euripides. Fabricius, W. Fontanelle. Gill. Graziani. Jerningham. Jones, W. La Fontaine. Lagny. Le Gendre. Levesque. Lister. Lydiat. Macquer. Mornay. Nicole, Cl. Oldys. Olivecrantz. Osorio. Penn. Pluquet. Pringle, Sir J. Renaudot. Sanctius. Scaliger, Jul. Schmid. Secker. Shipley. Simon. Speed. Swinton. Warwick, Sir P.

75. Æschines. Albert. Arcesilaus. Archimedes. Arriaga. Ashmole. Aubrey. Barlowe. Biondo. Boivin. Camerarius. Cocceius, H. Clarke, W. Conringius. Delaunoy. Dubois. Egnazio. Gibrat. Giraldus Cambrensis. Harmer. Heinsius, D. Hosius. Howe, J. Italicus, Sil. Johnson. Jurieu. Lalande. Lamy, B. Lamy, F. Languet. Law, W. Leland, J. Le Monnier, P. S. Leonico. Leusden. Mabillon. Magalotti. Maignan. Marivaux. Marsh, N. Martial. Meninski. Michaelis. Naude, P Olahus. Panard. Pearson. Pompignan. Quevedo. Quirini Rabutin. Reaumur. Regis. Rhodoginus.

Sanderson. Spon. Trapp. Usher. Vaniere. Watts. Wycherley.

76. Allix. Anselm. Augustine, St. Baldi. Bartholomew. Baxter, R. Bonamy. Boscovich. Bourdelot. Browne. Buchanan. Buffier. Bullet. Burton, J. Calepino. Collier, J. Daillé. De Lisle, C. Dufresnoy. Euler. Felibien, A. Fordyce. Frugoni. Gouge, T. Guichard. Hale, Sir M. Hevelius. Hoffman, M. Jarchi. Jouvency. Le Clerk, D. Le Gros. Lowth, R. Mably. Maimbourg. Marmontel. Mercurialis. Nassafi. Ogilby. Paremin. Perrault, C. Ray. Rolandino. Ruhnken. Salutato. Salvini. Segrais. Severinus. Sloane. Tooke, Horne. Vaillant. Vavasseur. Vincent. Wodhull. Werenfils. Wolf.

77. Atticus. Baker, Sir R. Baius. Bedford. Bessarion. Borlase. Brooke. Cassini, J. D. Chapman. Charlevoix. Commire. Cooper, Bp. Gedoyn. Hubert. Jablonsky. Jackson, J. Jefferys. Launoi. Le Beau. Le Grain. Logan. Mallebranche. Melmoth. Morin, P. Morin, S. Ochinus. Ozanam. Patru. Pellicer. Pontano. Porteus. Rescnius. Rigault. Sancroft. Scottus. Sedaine. Shepherd, R. Speed. Strada. Stukeley. Sydenham, F. Tansillo. Terrassen, H. Thoynard. Townson. Wetenhall. Wintle.

78. Aubery, A. Bacon. Bowyer. Bulkley. Catrou. Corneille. Decembrio. De la Hire. Derham. Ducange. Feydeau. Fléchier. Galileo. Gomar. Grey, R. Gouge, W. Grosseteste. Hacket. Jansenius, J. Jerome. Macknight. Maskelyne. Morales. Morel. Muller, G. F. Muratori. Murphy. Newton, R. Newton, T. Nicaise. Nicole, J. Nizzoli. Paulinus Nolanus. Philips, A. Poleni. Porteus, Bp. Possevino. Sackville. Sanderson, R. Ste. Foix. Siri. Sprat. Swift. Talbert. Warton, J.

79. Amyot. Angelo, P. Barthélemy. Bashuysen. Beausobre. Bellarmine. Benserade. Bracciolini, F. Bracciolini, P. Bruto. Burnaby. Castell. Chapelain. Chesterfield, Lord. Comenius. Crousaz. Cumberland, R. Daniel, G. Duchat. Emlyn. Gibson. Gibert. Gotti. Harvey. King. Kircher. Klopstock. Lancelot. Le Clerc. Leechman. Lilly. Limborch. Long, T. Lully. Maffæus, F. S. Maittaire. Massillon. Ménage. Nichols. Oudin, C. Oudin, F. Owen, H. Passionei. Petit, P. Placette. Poggio. Ricci. St. John. Segrais. Sharp Granville. Scherer. Tenison, Archbp. Upton. Vernukæus. Vertot. Wake. Warburton. Watson, Bp.

80. Avila. Bacon, R. Baluze. Bellori. Bentley. Boece. Bower. Buffon. Burnet, T. Capellus. Chalcondyles. Coverdale. Dandini. Dangeau. D'Aubigné. De Choisy. De Lisle, J. N.

Desmarets. Dumarsais. Duncombe. Edwards. Eratosthenes. Gatøker. Gaza. Geoerwel. Goodwin, T. Hasted. Hey, J. Hoffman, F. Jablonski. Juvenal. Le Grand. Leighton, R. Leo de Modena. Le Sage. Levi. Leu. Longuerue. Ludolph, J. Lysias. Mambrun. Maurolico. Morin. Mutis. Nardi. Newton, T. Nicoll, R. Nunez. Periander. Pitiscus. Pittacus. Polignac. Pythagoras. Quesnay. Quétif. Quintilian. Reyher. Rhazes. Riolan. Rollin. Scott, J. Sedley, Sir C. Sheldon. Slange. Solon. Spelman. Stesichorus. Stow. Sturmius, J. Terrasson, J. Usher. Walpole, Hor. Ward, J. Webb, F. Wieland. Wykeham, W.

81. Ameithon. Bernouilli. Cerda. Chaulieu. Cox, R. Crusius. D'Aguesseau. Dugdale. Duval. Emerson. Fabretti. Fleming. Gerald, P. L. Guyse. Hall. Hemsterhuis. Hopkins. Larrey. Lengle. Long, R. Mace, F. Machault. Magliabecchi. Olearius. Patrick. Plato. Racan. Raymond. Régnier. Septalius. Sepulveda. Simson. Spanheim, E. Sturm, J. Varro. Viviani. Wallius. Zaccaria. Zeno, Ap.

82. Arnauld. Athenodorus. Baldovini. Blackburne. Blair, H. Boecler. Brisson. Brown, Sir W. Bryant. Charpentier. Delany. Delarue. Epiphanius. Espen. Fleury. Gower. Grasset. Haillet de Couronne. Hardouin. Hayes, C. Hoffman, F. Hoogeveen. Jeannin. Jenyns, Soame. Jobert. Magryzy. Marchetti. Martin, D. Matheson. Mercator. Paul III. Percy, Bp. Peutinger Polybius. Pourchot. Rushworth. Wall, W. Waller. Wray.

83. Allatius. Benedict XIV. Bossuet. Boys. Brueys. Chrysippus. Clarke, S. Daubenton. Dickinson. Filelfo. Folard. Goldoni. La Martinière. Leland, T. Markland. Menedemus. Moncriff. Morell. Piron. Ruddiman. Salian. Schaaf. South. Swedenborg. Valerianus.

84. Baker, T. Barlow, T. Bathurst, R. Beccaria, J. B. Cassini, J. J. Cato, Censor. Diophantus. Duguet. Dumoulin, P. Fontaine. Gamaches. Hales, S. La Grange-Chancel. Lardner. Law, E. Le Monnier. Lobo. Marsham, Sir J. Mather. Metastasio. Newton, Sir J. Osterwald. Pearce, Z. Pighius. Pyle. Raynal. Ste. Palaye. Scriverius. Sherlock, Bp. Whiston. Xenocrates. Young.

85. Alexander, N. Anacreon. Arnauld d'Andilly. Bodmer. Calmet. Conant. D'Anville. Didymus. Gaspard. Geoffroy. Halley. Hénault. Hoadley. Holland, P. Home. Horrebow. La Mothe-le-Vayer. Latimer. L'Enfant. Longomontanus. Lycurgus. Martenne. Monboddo, Lord. Pacio. Pepusch. Pherecydes. Pingré. St. Lambert. St. Pierre. Scarborough. Sherburne. Southern. Suicer. Valesius. Voltaire. Zanotti.

86. Baker, Sir R. Barberini. Bellegarde. Beza. Chiabrera. Cibber. Coke, Sir E. Cumberland, Bp. Douglas, Bp. Duncan, D. Dupuy. Evelyn. Giorgi. Kames, Lord. Lambert, Marchioness. Maffæus, R. Mirabaud. Muzio. Olivet. Oughtred. Placide. Polycarp. Telemon.
87. Abauzit. Albertus Magnus. Boscager. Brantôme. Chamberlayne. Hooper, G. L'Estrange. Maracci. Mariana. Montfaucon. Pasquier. Pococke. St. Marthe. Strada. Victorius. Voetius. Wallis. Wesley.
88. Alamos. Bullialdus. Chevreau. Crébillon. Croft, Bp. Fitzherbert, T. Fortescue. Junius, F. Juvalta. Maracci. Monnoye. Tucker, Dean. Whitby.
89. Busby. Launay. Meibomius, M. Melmoth, W. Molanus. Murray, Lord Mansfield.
90. Allen, T. Carneades. Child. D'Autreau. Diogenes. Fleury, Cardinal. Floyer. Guarino. Holwell. Joachim. Joinville. Ladvocat, L. F. Lucian. Manget. Maynard. Morgagni. Nowell. Pacuvius. Palliot. Protagoras. Robinson. St. Evremond. Sharp, Archbp. Simonides. Sophocles. Walton, J. Xenophon.
91. Aurispa. Bathurst, Lord. Frassen. Hobbes. Hollman. Huet. Jerôme. Koraïb. Lloyd. Sloane. Vondel. Wren, Sir C.
92. Dupleix. Ferrari. Hutton, W. Kempis, T. à. Las Casas. Ruysch. Sirmond. Soanen. Thales. Wilson, Bp.
93. Emlyn. Hough, Bp. Irenæus. Joly, Cl. Mairan.
94. Burigny. Corneille, T. Duguet. Scudéry, Mad. de. Séneçai. Solomon. Strype. White, T.
95. Arnauld, H. Constant. Courayer. Gallus. Morton, T. Parcieux. Sebizius, M. Vignoles.
96. Cassiodorus. Corelli. Corvetto. Vida.
97. Epicharmus. Houbigant. Musitau. Myson.
98. D'Estrées. Gemist. Isocrates. Pellerin. St. Aulaire. Zeno.
99. Cleanthes. Democritus. Philemon.
100. Albumazar. Cantacuzenus. Cornaro. Fontenelle. Hesiod. Leslie, J.
103. Constantin.
104. Hippocrates.
105. Xenophilus.
107. Theophrastus.
114. Maino, Jason.
157 Epimenides.

ON THE

STYLE OF THE ANCIENT GREEK EPIGRAM.

DOCTOR Johnson has described an epigram to be, "a short poem terminating in a point:" which, although perhaps not quite particular enough as a definition,[1] may nevertheless pass tolerably well, provided that it be referred to the Epigrams of Martial only, and to those of modern times, which have, almost without exception, taken Martial for their pattern. Owen, the celebrated Welch Epigrammatist, (who is to Martial precisely what Casimir is to Horace as a lyric poet) alluding to the personal invective which abounds so much in Martial, and which he has taken care to introduce so plentifully into his own performances, has somewhere given it out, that "an epigram is nothing but a short satire, as a satire, on the other hand, is but a long epigram;"[2]—a definition, it is obvious, that needs taking in not a little, on the score of its too great roundness and latitude of assertion.

The Greek epigram was, however, very widely different from any thing of this kind. It was at first nothing more than a simple inscription, (as the term *epigram*,[3] in the Greek, implies) written sometimes in prose, sometimes in verse; and was originally appropriated to religious uses, being frequently fixed up over the porches of the temples, and upon the statues of the gods, and of deified men. This custom, it should seem, was derived from the Egyptians.[4] It was

---

[1] It would apply with equal propriety to a song; the only difference (says Addison) between that and an epigram [in the manner of Martial] being this,—"that the one does not require the lyric numbers, and is usually employed upon satirical occasions; whereas the business of the other, for the most part, is to express (as my Lord Roscommon translates it from Horace) "*Love's pleasing cares, and the free joys of wine.*"

[2] Nil aliud Satiræ quàm sunt Epigrammata longa;
Est præter Satiram nil Epigramma brevem.

[3] And so it is used in Cicero: "Atque hæc Sappho sublata quantum desiderium sui reliquerit, dici vix potest. Nam cum ipsa fuit egregiè facta, tum *epigramma* Græcum pernobile meisum habuit in basi, quod iste eruditus homo, et Græculus, qui hæc subtiliter judicat, qui solus intelligit, si unam literam Græcam scisset, certè non sustulisset." In Verr. IV. 57.

[4] Of the numerous hieroglyphical inscriptions of this sort, that are extant, at least in translation, it will be sufficient to select two; that which Plutarch tells us formerly stood over the gate-way of the temple of Minerva

afterwards, however, transferred to profane edifices, to the perpetuating of victories gained, and to the tombs of the departed.

"The brevity of these inscriptions," (says an elegant writer and translator of the present day) "which rendered it so easy to impress on the memory any particular event, or any illustrious name, soon recommended them to other purposes. The lawgiver adopted them to convey a moral precept, and the lover to express a tender sentiment; and hence, in process of time, almost every little poem, which concisely presented one distinct idea, or pursued one general argument, acquired the title of Epigram." In this manner was it, that the Greek epigram ultimately assumed a distinct character, and became, in fact, a particular species of writing. The poems in our own language that approximate the nearest to it, are to be found mainly in the train of those lighter compositions, that are comprehended generally under the term "Fugitive Pieces;" to which may be added many of our sonnets. Our epigrammatical style, on the other hand, is derived directly from Martial; who seems to have struck out the invention [1] chiefly from the Roman satire.

It must not however be forgotten, that even in Martial there are here and there epigrams evidently constructed on the same model with those of Greece: of which class, perhaps, may be reckoned those beautiful ones on a celebrated minion of Domitian, by name Earinus. The Epigrams of Claudian and Ausonius are for the most part of the same sort; in the latter of whom we meet with several specimens of *translation* from the Greek. Contrariwise, it appears, that some of the more modern Epigrams of the Greek Anthology, and

---

at Sais, and the one upon Sethon's statue in the temple of Vulcan. The former of these may be thus translated: *Thou that art coming into the world, thou that art leaving it, know this, that the Deity abominates impiety.* Clemens of Alexandria tells us, that the same inscription was formerly to be found upon the temple of Jupiter at Egyptian Thebes. Pythagoras seems to have had it in his eye, in the line Ἀιδῶ συνιστοῖς· θῦρας δ' ἐπίθεσθε βεβήλοις. Stob. p. 236. 3. ed. 2. Gesn. and there is reason for supposing that the sentence was once used in the same manner both by the Greeks and Romans. The other is much the same in import: *Let none dare to look upon me, save only the pious.* On the subject of these hieroglyphical inscriptions, the reader will find more in a prize-dissertation, entitled *Hieroglyphicorum Origo et Natura*, by Mr. James Bailey, of Trinity College, Cambridge.

[1] We do not mean that Martial was the first who introduced the writing of Epigrams into the Latin language; and only call that style of epigrammatic writing, for which he is so famous, his *invention*, because it seems, as appears to us, to have had the Roman Satire for its fountain, rather than the ancient Greek epigram. The Latin epigrams of Catullus, and even of Petronius, who lived close upon the time of Martial, are evidently built upon the style of the Greek. The same is the case with the well-known epigrams upon Ennius, Plautus, and Horace, and, we may add from numerous others, with the noted one which Julius Cæsar is said to have written upon Terence. In a word, it seems to have been so with all the Latin epigrams written before the time of Martial.

many of the satirical ones even of the better ages,[1] are precisely those, which *we* should call Epigrams at the present day.

A great part of the Latin Epigrams of Buchanan are translated from the Greek; so that they who may not be acquainted with that language, but know the Latin, will easily discern on perusing some of these, (not to mention those that Dr. Johnson rendered in his old age) that the nature and bent of the Greek Epigram, properly so called, are very different from what we find generally in Martial. The English reader (if he have not seen *Bland's Collections from the Greek Anthology*) may turn to a poem by the unfortunate Savage, entitled, "The Climax of Love;" which is a paraphrase upon Buchanan's translation of a Greek Epigram, or rather the close of one, by Rufinus.[2] Why he has lopped off the head, and left us the trunk only in his version of this beautiful little poem, I can in no wise divine. I shall, therefore, while on the subject, make bold to place a head, made of corresponding metal, upon this *sine nomine corpus*,—which it certainly is in the very closest sense of the expression,—leaving it to some one better qualified, and more inclined than myself to paraphrase the four first lines to a length, that will tally with Savage's translation of the four last; he having actually spun out each line into a complete stanza. Buchanan has given four lines for

---

[1] Of that kind is the following, which is preserved in Diogenes Laertius:

Μὰψ ἐμὲ λοιδορέεις, μὰψ, Ζώϊλε, καί σε ἐπαινῶ·
Οὐ γὰρ ἐμοῖς, οὐ σοῖς, πίστις ἐνεστι λόγοις.

We select this in order to observe, that it is the original, from which the annexed French epigram was taken, which Addison informs us once passed current abroad for an excellent song; adding, that the French did very often in his time "confound the song and the epigram, and take the one reciprocally for the other." He was evidently ignorant of the source from whence it sprang:

Tu parles mal par tout de moi,
Je dis du bien par tout de toi;
Ami, quel malheur est le nôtre?
L'on ne nous croit ni l'un, ni l'autre.

Translated by Addison, so:

Thou speakest always ill of me,
And I speak always well of thee:
But spite of all our noise and pother,
The world believes nor one nor t'other.

With respect to the Frenchman, I am inclined to suspect that he got at the epigram through the medium of Buchanan's Latin:

Frustra ego te laudo; frustra me, Zoile, lædis
Nemo mihi credit, Zoile; nemo tibi.

[2] Ὄμματ' ἔχεις Ἥρης, Μελίτη, τὰς χεῖρας Ἀθήνης,
Στήθεα τῆς Κύπριδος, τοὺς τε πόδας Θέτιδος.
Εὐδαίμων, ὁ βλίπων σε, τρισόλβιος ὅστις ἀκούει,
Ἡμίθεος δ' ὁ φιλῶν, ἀθάνατος δ' ὁ συνών.

two of the Greek; and we have taken care to preserve the same proportion.

Junonis oculi sunt tibi,
O! Melita; Palladis manus;
Veneris papillæ; quosque habet
Argenteos Thetis pedes.
Qui te videt, beatus est;
Beatior, qui te audiet;
Qui basiat, semideus est;
Qui te potitur, est deus.

As it is not usual to see compositions in our language, written, or professing to be written, *designedly* in the manner of the ancient Greek Epigram, the following lines (which were produced in the summer of 1810) will, if they possess no other merit, at least have novelty to set them off. It is but fair to add, that they gave rise, in a great measure, to the foregoing remarks.[1]

To a Rose.

Child of Summer, beauteous Rose!
All thy opening charms disclose,
While, descending from above,
Zephyrs woo and win thy love.

Could I but my wish obtain,
Gaining all I want to gain,
Thou shouldst be the maid I love,
I, a Zephyr from above.

UC-ALEGON.

[1] It is well known that Sir William Browne bequeathed a gold medal to the university of Cambridge, to be given annually to that undergraduate, who should write the best pair of Greek and Latin epigrams, the former in the manner of the choicest epigrams of the Greek Anthology, the latter after the model of Martial. We have heard that, not very long ago, it was in contemplation to abolish this prize, on account of its alleged insignificance. I am far from subscribing to Rollin's extravagant assertion, that to put together a good epigram needs as much management as to write a good epic poem; but I much question if, among all the prizes that the university has to give away, there is one so well calculated as this to try the *versatility* of a man's talents: particularly when we consider that it by no means follows, that he, who can imitate Martial with success, should be able to work off a good *Greek* epigram, and *versâ vice*;—the manner of these two species of composition being, as we have shown, so peculiarly different. It is some argument in favour of the worth of this prize, that of *forty* men that have gained it, since its first institution in 1776, there are but *seven* that have not obtained one prize, at the least, besides; which is more by a great deal than can be said of either class of Ode-men. Add to this, that the medal has very seldom indeed fallen to the lot of any person more than once,—that twice it was not awarded at all, which cannot be said of either of the ode-medals,—that the number of competitors is usually greater by far for this, than for any other university-prize,—and moreover, (a fact which out-herods all the rest) that the best poems, altogether, in the *Musæ Cantabrigienses* are EPIGRAMS.

E. H. BARKERI

EPISTOLA CRITICA AD TH. GAISFORDIUM, DE FRAGMENTIS POETARUM MINORUM GR.

PARS QUINTA.

ΦΙΛΗΤΗΣ. Vide GAISFORD. ad Hesiodi *E. κ. Η.* i. 373. "Suidam et Etymologum," inquit T. Hemsterh. ad J. Poll. ix. 135., "nominis ratio latuit; non enim ita *κατ' ἀντίφρασιν* dicti, sed quod oculis amplexuque benigno deceptos homines trucidarent. Audi Senecam Epist. 51.: 'Voluptates præcipue exturba, et invisissimas habe, latronum more, quos philetas Ægyptii vocant: in hoc nos amplectuntur, ut strangulent.'" Imo Senecæ locus, a T. H., Gaisfordio et aliis male intellectus, sensu verborum postulante, sic interpungi debet: "Voluptates præcipue exturba et invisissimas habe: latronum more, quos *philetas* Ægyptii vocant, in hoc nos amplectuntur, ut strangulent." Suspicor conj. *enim*, in præcedenti voce *latronum* absorptam, e textu excidisse; nam hic est sensus: 'Voluptates præcipue exturbandæ et invisissimæ habendæ; latronum enim more, quos Ægyptii ideo *philetas* vocant, in hoc solum nos amplectuntur, ut strangulent.' Vide *nov. Thes. Gr. L.* p. ccclxvi. a.[1]

ARCHILOCHI Fragm. xxxiv. p. 305., *Οὐκ ἂν μύροισι ἐουσ' ἠλείφετο.* "Athen. xiv. p. 688. C., *Τῷ δὲ τοῦ μύρου ὀνόματι πρῶτος Ἀρχίλοχος κέχρηται λέγων. Οὐκ ἂν . . . καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ δ' ἔφη· Ἐσμυρισμένας.*—Sequens fragm. male reddidit Athenæi interpres. Sensus est. *Coma ejus et pectus ita unguentis erat delibutum, ut vel senem amore incenderet*, quod non fugit perspicacissimum G. Wakefield, in S. C. iv. p. 43. ubi *ἐσμυρισμένη* corrigit, quod verum videtur." Jacobsius ap. Gaisfordium.

Pro *Athen.* xiv. *p.* 688. C. lege, *Athen.* xv. *p.* 688. C. An leg. *ἐσμυρισμέναι*, ex Hesychii glossa, qui huc respexisse videri possit, *Ἐσμυρίγμέναι*, (l. *ἐσμυρισμέναι*) *μεμυρισμέναι*? Reiskius ibi vulgatam retinet lectionem: "*Σμυρίζειν* et *σμυρνίζειν*," inquit, "fut.—*ισω*, et *ιξω*." In Cod. Ven. est *ἐσμυριχμέναι*: a typ. in Ald., notante Schowio, *ἐσμυρίγμέναι*. Vide *nov. Thes. Gr. L.* p. ccclv. a. Sed nullus dubito, quin Hesychio restituendum sit *ἐσμυρνισμέναι*, ut legendum conjecerat Salmasius. *Σμυρίζειν* enim s.

[1] Hæc dudum scripseram, cum mecum per literas benigne communicaverit vir egregius, idemque mihi amicissimus, J. Fr. Boissonadius, nullum Senecæ codicem *philetas*, quæ est Mureti emendatio, exhibere, et Schweighæuserum cujus nota legenda est, locum interpungere eo ipso modo, quem ego propono.

σμυρίζειν est verbum nihili: nemo veterum unquam sic dixit, vel dicere potuit. Sed et Athenæi locus simili mendo laborat. "Ad explicandum hoc verbum Athenæus notat: *Μύρρα γὰρ ἡ σμύρνα παρ' Αἰολεῦσι, ἐπειδὴ τὰ πολλὰ τῶν μύρων διὰ σμύρνης ἐσκευάζετο, καὶ ἥ γε στακτὴ καλουμένη διὰ μόνης ταύτης.* Sed a σμύρνη, σμυρνίζω, ἐσμυρνισμένη potius legendum videtur, et sic reapse occurrit in sacris litteris apud Marc. xv. 23., *Καὶ ἐδίδουν αὐτῷ πιεῖν ἐσμυρνισμένον οἶνον.*" Liebelius p. 85. Rem acu tetigit vir doctus, qui tamen Hesychii glossam notare debuerat. Omnino lege in Athenæo vel ἐσμυρνισμέναι, vel ἐσμυρνισμένας, ut Athenæo et Hesychio inter se conveniat.

ARCHILOCHI Fragm. lxxxix. p. 318. "Multo magis suspectum est, vel potius aperte mendosum, quod apud Suidam legimus de ἄ significante τὸ πολὺ ap. Archilochum. Postquam enim dixit ἄ significare etiam ὦ, et attulit Homeri locum, *ἄ δειλή τι κακῶν*, pro quibus reponi hæc debent, *ἄ δειλοὶ τὶ κακὸν*, addit significare etiam πολὺ et *μέγα* ap. Archilochum: subjungitque hæc verba, *ἄ δέκα ταύρους*, quod exemplum aliter apud Varinum scriptum extat, hoc videlicet modo, *ἄ, ἔαδ' εἵς τε ταύρους*. Sed non video quid commodi ex hac scripturæ illius mutatione, undecunque sit, percipere possimus. Equidem literam hanc τὸ *μέγα* et τὸ πολὺ significare, et ipse antea docui, sed præfixam quibusdam vocabulis." H. Steph. *Thes. G. L. ed. nov.* p. 21. B. Archilochi verba in Platonis Schol. p. 134. sic exhibentur: *Ἅ ἔαδ' εἵς τε ταύρους.* In Siebenkeesii Anecd. Gr. p. 72. pro *ταύρους* est *ταύροις*. Teste H. Stephano in Phavorino legitur *ἔαδ'*. At in editione Basileensi 1538., qua utor, est *ἔα δ'*. Sic in Phavorino scriptum legerat Kusterus, ut patet e nota ad Suidam, non δ' ἔα, ut GAISFORDIUS ad Archilochi Fragm. p. 318., Kusterum citans, falso tradit. "Legitur in Suida hoc fragmentum Archilochi, *Ἅ δέκα ταύρους*, (Interpres, *Decem magnos tauros*,) pro quibus verbis Scholiasta Platonicus p. 134. cum Phavorino habet, *Ἅ ἔα δ'* [imo, Schol. Plat., ut jam dixi, habet *ἔαδ'*] *εἵς τε ταύρους*. Hoc quid sibi velit, ignoro: id video, δ' εἵς τε prodisse ex eodem compendio, quo δέκα significaretur." Bast.[1] ad Gregor. Cor. p. 245. "Ἅ interjectio vel exclamatio esse videtur admirantis vel magnitudinem, vel multitudinem rei. Suidæ lectio, *Ἅ δέκα ταύρους, Ah decem tauros!* quæ saltem sensum qualemcunque admittit, præferenda cuique videbitur." Liebelius ad Archilochi Reliq. p. 223. cujus sententiam calculo meo comprobare non dubito. Archilochum enim locutum fuisse de magnitudine et multitudine rei, testantur Schol. Plat. Suid. et Phavor., *Σημαίνει δὲ καὶ τὸ πολὺ καὶ μέγα παρ'*

[1] Nota est Schæferi, qui Bastianam animadversionem protulit. Vide *nov. Thes. G. L.* l. c.

'Αρχιλόχῳ. At, nisi, cum Suida, legas δέκα, nullum multitudinis indicium invenias. Vide not. 4. ad *nov. Thes. G. L.* l. c.

ARCHILOCHI Fragm. xcvi. p. 320. " Fortasse legendum

ὥστ' ὄνου Πριηνέως
κήλωνος ἐπλήμυρον ὀτρυγηφάγου."

Elmsleius ap. Gaisford. in Append. ad Vol. i. p. xxxix. Sic ante Elmsleium, ut notare debuerat Gaisfordius, conjecerat Liebelius ad Archilochi Fragm. p. 194. quem vide.

ARCHILOCHI Fragm. xi. p. 292. Nec Liebelius p. 120. nec Gaisfordius notavit hos versus protulisse auctorem libri de Vita et Poesi Homeri in Plutarchi Opp. p. 1195. ed. Wyttenb. ubi sic leguntur:

Ἔτι Ὁμήρου εἰπόντος·

Τοῖος γὰρ νόος ἐστὶν ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων,
Οἷον ἔπ' ἦμαρ ἄγῃσι πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε.

Ἀρχίλοχος τά τε ἄλλα αὐτοῦ μιμούμενος, καὶ τοῦτο μὲν παρέφρασεν, εἰπών·

Τοῖος ἀνθρώποισι θυμὸς, Γλαύκιε Λεπτίνεω παῖ,
Γίνεται θνητοῖς, ὁποῖον Ζεὺς ἐπ' ἡμέρην ἄγει.

Ubi pro Γλαῦκε, quod reperitur in locis a Jacobsio et Liebelio laudatis, Γλαύκιε habemus. Gaisfordius post Jacobsium ὁκοίην—ἄγει edidit, sed vera lectio est ὁκοῖον—ἄγῃ, ut vidit Liebelius, qui, Ἄγῃ, inquit, secundum Homericum ἄγῃσι e Stobæo. Sed et Græcæ linguæ ratio, ut mihi saltem videtur, ἄγῃ postulat. De lectione vero ὁκοῖον vide quæ scripsit idem Liebelius.

In Gaisfordiano Archilochi Indice desiderantur vocabula Ἀγόμενος, Ἀζυγία s. Ἄζυγα, Ἄκομψον, Διστόσῃ, Ἔτρεψεν, Ἡμισύτριτον, Πυῤῥιχίζειν, Πύῤῥος, quæ leguntur in p. 325. item Σάλπιγξ, et Σκελήπερον, in seq. pag. Item in Gaisfordiano Simonidis Indice desideratur Ταμύναι, quod legitur in Fabricii notitia de Simonide p. 351.

" In nominibus propriis e scribendi comperdiis nata latent ubique peccata. In Etym. M. p. 715. 46. legitur Ἀρίσταρχος in Edd. sed in MS. Leid. ἀρχλ literis sibi invicem impositis: [vide Gaisford. p. 320. quem præterit hic locus:] hoc genuinum est Archilochi nomen, quo lacuna suppleri poterit in v. Ἀλφὸς p. 72. 39., Ἀλφός· παρὰ τὸ ἀλλοφανής τις εἶναι, σημαίνει δὲ τὸν λεπρόν· παρὰ τὸ ἐναλλάσσειν τὴν χροιάν· τὸ γὰρ ἐναλλάσσειν, παρὰ τῷ . . ἀλφαίνειν ἐγίνετο. MS. Dorv., Παρὰ τῷ ἀρχ ἀλφαίνειν ἔγινε, i. e. Ἀρχιλόχῳ." L. C. Valck. in Schol. ad Eurip. Phœn. v. 1163. Mirum est insignem hunc locum Gaisfordii diligentiam effugisse.

ARCHILOCHI Fragm. lxxviii. p. 193. in collectione Liebeliana: Τιμῶμαι αὐτὸν ἐν μισθοφόρου καὶ τοῦ τυχόντος στρατιώτου μοίρᾳ. Vide *Class. Journ.* xxvi p. 390. et 393. Nunc demum video me, de hoc loco scribentem, actum egisse. Ruhnkenius enim in præclara sua Præfat. ad Hesych. p. vii. " Ad examinis subtilitatem," inquit " revocemus Scholion Cod. Vossiani ad Il. *I.* 378.

explicans vexatum illud. *Τίω δὲ μιν ἐν Καρὸς αἴσῃ*, quod protulit L. C. V. Diss. de Schol. in Hom. med. p. 97. *Ἀλκαῖος μὲν ὁ ἐπιγραμματοποιὸς ἐγκέφαλον ἤκουσεν.—Ἀρχίλοχος δὲ, τιμῶμαι αὐτὸν ἐν μισθοφόρου καὶ τοῦ τυχόντος στρατιώτου μοίρᾳ. Αυσανίας δὲ ὁ Κυρηναῖος, καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης, καὶ Ἀρίσταρχος, ἐν κηρὸς μοίρᾳ φασὶ λέγειν τὸν ποιητὴν, Δωρικῶς μεταβαλόντα τὸ η εἰς α.* In hoc Scholio nullo modo licet Archilochi nomen in Aristarchi mutare. Quid ergo? An Archilochus ex hoc loco inter Homeri interpretes referetur? Minime vero. Ipse contentus est ea gloria ut, cujus carminis primus auctor fuerit, in eo perfectissimus judicetur: Grammatici laudem sibi non magnopere expetendam putat. Ne multa, rem sic intellige: Quemadmodum Schol. ex Alcæi imitatione (de qua v. T. H. ad Aristoph. Plut. p. 7.) elicuit, quam ille in Homero lectionem probasset, sic etiam ex Archilochi quodam versu, quam ille Homerici loci interpretationem secutus esset, collegit. Archilochi versum conservavit Schol. Plat. MS."

"Notandus est Suidæ locus: *Ἐν Καρὸς εἵπετο τάξει· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐμισθοφόρει, ἐπειδὴ πρῶτοι Κᾶρες ἐμισθοφόρησαν.* Verba ex aliquo poeta depromta sunt." Sic scripsi in *Class. Journ.* xxvi. p. 394. Sed T. H. ad Aristoph. Plut. p. 7. notat "Juliani esse verba Or. ii. p. 56. C." Locus est hic: *Τὸ δὲ ἡμέτερον· οὔτω γὰρ καλεῖν ἄξιον· † ὅπως Ῥωμαίων βία καὶ οὐ γνώμῃ ξυνηκολούθησεν, ἐοικὸς ἐπικούροις καὶ μισθοφόροις, ἐν Καρὸς εἵπετο τάξει καὶ σχήματι.* Utrum vero Julianus ad poetam aliquem respexerit, an versus hexametri finem ex tempore fuderit, *Ἐν Καρὸς εἵπετο τάξει*, viderint alii.

"Schol. Aristoph. Nub. 109.: *Φασιανούς· οἱ μὲν ἵππους, οἱ δὲ ὄρνεα. Ἔνιοι δὲ ἵππους χάραγμα ἔχοντας φασιανοῦ, ὡς ἀλεκτρυόνος—οἱ δὲ περὶ Ἀρχίλοχον, ὀρνίθων γένος. Οἱ περὶ Ἀρχίλοχον* solito idiotismo Græcorum pro *Ἀρχίλοχος*, apud quem *Φασιανὸς* notum avis genus indicat." Liebelius ad Archilochi Reliq. p. 256. Vide nov. *Thes. Gr. L.* p. ccxciv. b. Sed Archilochi nomen in Aristarchi mutandum est. "Locus, in quo Archilochi nomen laborat, est ap. Schol. Aristoph. ad Nub. 109. et Suidam, qui Scholiasten descripsit, v. *Φασιανοί*. Hic non dicam Archilochos, sed ne interpretes quidem Archilochi locum inveniant. Neque enim illorum erat dicere, quid *Φασιανοὶ* apud Aristoph., equosne an aves, significent, sed Aristarchi, qui Aristophanem commentariis illustravit. Scribendum igitur, *οἱ δὲ περὶ Ἀρίσταρχον*." Ruhnk. Præfat. ad Hesych. p. vii.

SIMONIDIS Fragm. cxvi. p. 405. *Σιμωνίδης περὶ Αἰτύλου.* Vide quæ scripsi in *Class. Journ.* xxvi. p. 387. Doctissimus auctor articuli in *Class. Journ.* xxviii. p. 360. cui titulus *Curæ posteriores*, hæc notavit:—"Barkerus ait nescire se *περὶ Βαιτύλου*, an *περὶ Αἰτύλου*, in Apostolio legatur. *Περὶ Αἰτύλου* legitur." "Apostol. Cent. 15. Adag. 97. legit, *Ὅθεν Σιμωνίδης περὶ Αἰτύλου φησὶν οὕτως.* An *Σιπύλου*? de quo vid. Suid." Godofr. Olearii Notæ ad Suid. p. 288. De Sipylo autem vide Olearium l. c. p. 299.

THEOGNIS v. 1097., *Βρόγχον ἀποῤῥήξας.* Vide nostra in *Class. Journ.* xxvi. p. 391. "Dubitare non debuit vir doctissimus de mente SCHÆFERI, qui conjecit legendum *βρόχχον*: recte de nominis forma dubitavit. Sed nec credo cum Brunckio versum fuisse *ἀκέφαλόν*. *Βρόκχον* quidem non scribebant, sed forte vox legentis *τῷ χ* ita hærebat, ut syllaba *βρό* produceretur." Auctor articuli, cui titulus *Curæ posteriores* in *Class. Journ.* xxviii. p. 360. "*Βρόχον* SCHÆFERO ad Schol. Apollon. R. T. ii. p. 137. mutandum videtur in *βρόκχον*, sed HERMANNUS in novo de Metr. Gr. et Rom. opere p. 60. ob arseos vim et accentum excusat." Fr. Tr. Friedmanni de Media Syllaba Pentametri Gr. p. 357.[1]

Thetfordiæ, Maii xx. 1817. *E. H. BARKER.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Prices of some articles, at the recent sale of Count M'Carthy's Library, in Paris—

Anthologia Græca, 4to Flor. 1494. 1000f.
Apollonii Rhodii Argon., 4to Flor. 1496. 1755f.
Ciceronis Officia, Mogunt., 1465. 800f.
——————————— 1466. 1190f.
Euripides, Barnes, fol. Camb. 1694. 1800f.
Psalmorum Codex, fol. Mogunt. 1457. 12,000f.
——————————— 1459. 3,350f.
Quintiliani Inst. Orat. fol. Ven. 1471. 1515f.
Virgilius, fol. 1472. 2440f.
Xenophon, 5 vols. 8vo Oxon. 1703. l. p. 1960f.
————Cyrop. and Anab. fol. Oxon. 1727. and 1735. l. p. 2,550f.

---

[1] In *Class. Journ.* xxviii. p. 287. not. i. pro *voc. σύμφοίτητις* lege, *vox σ.* Alciphron iii. 61., Ἀλλ' ἐγὼ μὲν ἐν ταπεινῷ τῷ σχήματι τὴν πατρῴαν ἀποβαλὼν οὐσίαν, ἀγαπῶ τῇ γαστρὶ τὴν ἀναγκαίαν πλησιαστὴν ἐκπορίζων.

"Scriptum ἐκποριζειν. Potest et ἐκποριζόμενος, ut supra." Bergler. "Quem locum Alciphronis alium in mente habuerit Bergler us, non habeo dicere. Ad sensum similis est Lib. i. Ep. 15., Ἀγαπητὸς ἐκπορίζοντα, non ἐκποριζόμενον." Wagner. Bergler o dubio procul in animo erat locus, qui legitur in L. i. Ep. 5., Ἐγὼ δὲ ἀγαπῶ τὴν τῶν ἀναγκαίων εὐπορίαν ἐκ τῆς καθημερινῆς ἐργασίας τῶν χειρῶν ποριζόμενος. Ibi enim in nota Bergler us habet ἐκποριζόμενος, tanquam si sic suo in textu edidisset, cum revera ibi legatur ποριζόμενος. Quid igitur de hac re statuendum est? Utrum ποριζόμενος, typothetæ culpa, pro ἐκποριζόμενος in Bergleri, deinde in Wagneri irrepsit textum? An Bergler us ipse in nota ἐκποριζόμενος negligenter pro ποριζόμενος scripsit, deinde vero in nota ad L. iii. 61. suum errorem repetiit? Mihi videtur in textu pro ποιζόμενος reponendum ἐκποριζόμενος, ut ἐκπορίζειν in L. iii. 61. Ut ut sit, vulgata tamen lectio satis proba est; nam e Xenophontis (Œcon. xi. 10. Bergler us affert: Πολλοὶ δ' ἀγαπῶσιν, ἢν δύνωνται τὰ ἑαυτοῖς ἀρκοῦντα πορίζεσθαι. **V.** Lex. Xenoph. v. Πορίζεσθαι.

ON THE

SAPPHIC AND ALCAIC METRES.

Part III.—[*Continued from No. XXIX. p.* 115.]

I WILL pass now to the subject of Hiatus. It has been well observed by some, who have preceded me in this inquiry, that it by no means follows, that the same licence, which is allowed to one species of metre, may be extended to all others. In particular, I believe that a hiatus is only admissible in the dactylic feet of the Sapphic verse, and not in the trochaic. The remains of the Sapphic metre in Greek are so few, that it is unsafe to establish any point upon their authority alone. As far, however, as their authority extends, they afford no example of a hiatus in the trochaic feet, but one in the dactylic, as, *φαίνομαι ἄπνους*. Many books too give *Σαπφοῖ ἀδικῆ*, but probably the better reading is with an elision *Σάπφ' ἀδικήῃ*. In another metre of Sappho, but which is also dactylic, we find two hiatuses in one line, as *ὡς γλυκύμαλον ἐρεύθεται ἄκρῳ ἐπ' ὄσδῳ*. Alcæus too in the choriambic metre, which is allied to the dactylic, admits a hiatus, as

Ἄδ' ὥρα χαλεπὰ, πάντα δὲ διψῇ ὑπὸ κεύματος.

I do not know any example of a hiatus in the *middle* dactyl of the Sapphic colon, but Catullus, who probably imitated some Greek model, affords several instances of a hiatus in the dactylic foot of his hendecasyllables, as

Te in circō, tĕ in omnibus libellis.	Carm. 53. v. 4.
Essem, tē, mī ămice, quæritando.	Ib. v. 32.
Uno in lectŭlo ĕrudituli ambo.	55. v. 7.
Malè est mehĕrcŭlĕ, et laboriosē.	36. v. 2.

As the hiatus in the preceding instances is contrary to the practice of the Latin language, which elides long and short vowels without distinction, we may be sure that Catullus employed it in affectation of the Greek manner. Virgil abounds with similar licences chiefly in Greek proper names, but not exclusively. There is an instance in Catullus, and, I believe, but one, of a hiatus after a *short* vowel, as

O factŭm mălĕ! O miselle Passer! 3. v. 16.

and this may be defended, like Virgil's,

Et vera incessu patuit dĕă. Ille ubi matrem. 1 Æn. v. 20.

and upon the same principles, as there is in both cases a pause in the sentence, and a termination of the foot in a whole word at the hiatus. By this means the offence to the ear is much diminished. At the same time, licences of this kind, which occur once or twice only in a whole book, are not to be used by the writers of a single ode. Callimachus, indeed, and Theocritus admit without scruple a hiatus after a short vowel, but it does not appear to have been adopted by the Latin poets, and is contrary, I believe, to the practice of the more ancient Greek poets. There is one line in Catullus, where a hiatus, and that too a hiatus after a short vowel, seems to exist in the trochaic foot,

Gallicum Rhenum, horribilēsquĕ ūltĭmosque Britannos. 11. v. 11.

But here, perhaps, the que suffers a diæresis, and is resolvable into the dissyllable quĕ, in the same manner as cuï occurs in Prudentius for cui,

Cæsar-augustam vocitamus urbem,
Res cuï tanta est. Peri Stephanon.

This diæresis has been adopted by Sarbievius, as

Fluctuat Pontus, cuï militares
Instruat undas. Lyr. L. 1. Ode 14.

Upon the whole, I apprehend that such a hiatus as occurs in the following lines is exceptionable,

Δεσμῷ ἔμπλεξεν κρατερῷ πλανάτας. Musæ Cantab. p. 116.
Οἰστροδίνητος σεσάλευται ἀμφί. Ib. p. 142.
Δρέψεται ὕπνων μαλακῶν ἄωθ', ὡς. Class. Journ. No. xxii. p. 241.

It is observable that a hiatus, like the preceding, is not to be found in many of the odes in the Musæ Cantabrigienses, and has no doubt studiously been avoided.

On the contrary, I believe that a hiatus, such as occurs in the following lines, is admissible,

Τὶν βοηθῷ χρωμένα· ἢ τὺ τείνεις. Musæ Cantab. p. 117.
Εἴτε τούς γ' (ἀδει) ἀνέπεμψε νίκη. Class. Journ. No. 22. p. 240.
Καὶ τύ γ' ὡς πομπεύῃ, Ἰὼ τὺ πομπή. Ib. p. 242.
ὠρανῷ ἔστας. Musæ Cantab. p. 114.

I am aware that Boeckhius (De metris Pindari, p. 102.) is of opinion that in the trochaic metre, whenever the last syllable of the word is in arsis, that is, begins the foot, and terminates in a long vowel, a hiatus is allowed, and he gives the following verses as examples :

Ἀντιθεὶς Ὀρθωσίᾳ | ἔγραψεν ἰράν. Olymp. Carm. 3. v. 55.
Πατρὸς δὲ Θεσσαλοῦ | ἐπ' Ἀλφεοῦ. Ib. Carm. 13. v. 48.

I am not prepared to combat this principle, but I must observe, that the authorities do not in my mind establish the point, for which they are produced. I conceive, that the first line is not composed entirely of trochees, but consists of *two* colons, the one a trochaic dimeter catalectic, and the other an iambic penthimemer. In the same way the line of Horace,

Trahuntque siccas | machinæ carinas. Lib. 1. Ode 4.

is sometimes scanned as a trimeter catalectic, whereas it consists in fact of two separate colons, namely an iambic penthimemer, and an ithyphallic.

The second line,

Πα-τρὸς δὲ Θεσσα- | λοῦ ‖ ἐπ' Ἀλφεοῦ.

may likewise be considered as composed of *two* colons, namely, of a trochaic base preceded and followed by a syllable, like the choriambic,

Εὐ- | ρὼν Ἐπίχαρ- | μος,

and of an iambic dipodia for a close.

In such case, namely at the end of a colon, a hiatus after a *long* vowel is frequently admissible, as much as at the end of a line, as in Horace,

Fervidiore mero | arcana promovet loco. Epod. 11. v. 14.

Upon this principle the first line in Pindar's fourteenth Olympiad, as it appears in the common editions, may be defended, and does not require λακοῖσαι to be converted into λακοῖσαν; an alteration which Boeckhius, not content with suggesting, has introduced into the text. The only alteration necessary is to consolidate into one line what is generally extended into two, and in this manner I will exhibit it together with its corresponding verse in the antistrophe:

Καφισίων ‖ ὑδά- | των λακοῖσαι ‖ αἵτε ναίετε καλλίπωλον ἔδραν.
Ὦ πότνι' Ἀγ- ‖ λαΐ- | α, φιλησῖ- ‖ μολπέ τ' Εὐφροσύνα θεῶν κρατίστου.

By this means we escape the division of the word φιλησί-μολπε into parts of two distinct lines, as practised by Dawes, (Miscellanea Crit. p. 69.) and suggested by Böckh in another work, Ueber die Versmasse des Pindaros, p. 216. It appears to me, that the preceding lines consist of three colons, an iambic dipodia, a dochmiac, or rather a trochaic dipodia, with two short syllables prefixed, and a Phalecian hendecasyllable, and that these three colons form altogether but one line. The only difference between the two lines is, that the final syllable of the second colon in the first line is long by nature, and in the second line is short by nature, and that in the first line the second colon terminates in a whole

word, while in the second line it terminates in the middle of a word; but those who can reconcile the colon

Scribere versiculōs,

with

Inachiâ furerĕ,

and the Alcaic

Quæ cura Patrum, || quæ me Quiritium. L. 4. Ode 14.

with

Spectandus in cer- || tamine Martĭo. Ib.

in the strict versification of Horace, need not be offended at the recurrence of similar licences in the loose and more rhythmical versification of Pindar. I have called the colon ὑδάτων λακοῖσαι, and its antistrophe λαΐα φιλησι- a trochaic dipodia with two short syllables prefixed, rather than a dochmiac, as I doubt whether a short syllable can be made long by reason of terminating a colon, unless it be at the termination of an entire word also. But the last syllable of a ditrochee is undoubtedly common, and therefore as trochees, τῶν λἄκοῖσαι and -ᾱ φῐλῆσῐ- antistrophize together. I will observe that the same indulgence is granted to the end of a colon, which is granted to the end of a line, except that a hiatus after *a short* vowel is tolerated only at the end of a line, and not at the end of a colon. This is one of the distinctions between a colon and a line, a nice distinction rather, but, I believe, a just one. An elision is *never* necessary at the end of a line, but is often and almost always required of a *short* vowel at the end of a colon.—A short syllable, however, at the end of a colon, instead of a long syllable, is only interdicted, when a hiatus takes place, or when the final syllable falls in the middle of a word, as in the preceding colon, -λαΐα φιλησῐ- which on this account cannot be a dochmiac, for there is no instance, I believe, of a dochmiac terminating in a short syllable, unless it terminate a word also, as ὑπνοδόταν νόμῐὄν—ἰὼ ἰὼ πόποι. See Seidler, p. 48. When there is no hiatus, a short syllable is perfectly admissible, as in Horace.

Reducet in sedem vicĕ || nunc et Achæmeniâ. Epod. 13. v. 11.
Findunt Scamandri flumĭnă || lubricus et Simois. Ib. v. 20.

Had Dawes (Miscel. Crit. p. 32.) attended to this distinction, he would have left untouched the following verses of Catullus:

Quis deus magis ah magĭs || est petendus amantibus.
Sordebam tibi, villicĕ || concubine, hodie atque heri
Noscitetur ab omnibŭs || et pudicitiam suæ.

Indeed this very licence occurs in a poem in the same choriambic metre, which is imputed to Catullus, and where is found this line,

Pro queis omnia honoribŭs || hæc necesse Priapo. Carm. 19. v. 17. Ed. Delp.

There is still less occasion for any alteration, when the colon

terminates in a *long* vowel, although there be a hiatus, as a hiatus in such a case is perfectly admissible. The following verse, therefore, needs also no amendment,

Uxor in thalamo est tibī || ore floridulo nitens.

If the final syllable in tibī be considered here as *long* by nature, the retention of it without elision is as justifiable as in the line of Horace,

Vincere mollitiē || amor Lycisci me tenet. Epod. 11. v. 24.

What misled Dawes was probably an observation, that in another verse of Catullus,

Sola cognita sed marito || ista non eadem placent. V. 147.

an elision is made of the long final vowel; but it should have been considered, that Catullus did this not of necessity, but in conformity to a peculiarity of the Latin tongue, which admits the elision of long vowels. Horace in the same manner sometimes sustains a long vowel without an elision, after the Greek fashion, and at another time after the Latin manner elides it, as

Unde vocalem temere insecutā || Orphea sylvæ. Lib. 1. O. 12. v. 7.
Pendulum zonâ bene te secutā e- || lidere collum. Lib. 3. O. 27. v. 59.

But whenever the colon terminates in a short vowel, a hiatus is inadmissible, and an elision regularly, and among the best poets almost *uniformly*, takes place, as in Catullus

Sancta nomine Romulique || antiquam, ut solita es, bonâ. Carm. 32. v. 22.
Flammeum video venire || ite concinite in modum. Carm. 59. v. 123.

In these cases of elision the syllable elided is always hypermetrical; otherwise the metre would be defective. On this account Buchanan has committed an inadvertence in the line,

Cumque suo scelerĕ || a stirpe vellis impios. Psalm. 145.

This is carrying the licence one step beyond Horace, and levelling all distinction between a colon, and a line. That this licence is not allowed to a simple colon is rendered manifest by the fact, that, while such a hiatus is cautiously avoided at the end of a colon, it is freely admitted at the end of a line, or, what is the same thing, of a strophe. Thus in the 11th Ode of the Epodes two instances occur,

Mollibus in pueris || aut in puellis urerĕ
Hic tertius, etc.

Jussus abire domum || ferebar incerto pedĕ
Ad non, etc.

In the 13th of the Epodes, there is another instance:

Occasionem de die || dumque virent genuā,
Et decet, etc.

So too in the Epithalamium of Catullus a hiatus occurs often after a *short* vowel at the end of the *strophe*, but not elsewhere, as

Prodeas, nova nupta. v. 100.
O cubile, quod omnibus.
Io Hymen Hymenæe. v. 155.
En tibi domus ut potens.
Non abscondis amorem. v. 205.
Ille pulvis Erythrii.

The seeming offence against the preceding rule which occurs in

Ite, concinite in modŭm || Io Hymen Hymenæe Io. v. 124.

and in several other lines before the intercalary ejaculation, Io Hymen Hymenæe Io, has been well explained by Dawes; or it may be said, that in these cases the strophe terminates at the intercalary ejaculation, and that verses, containing nothing but passionate exclamations, are not subject to the strict ordinary rules of metre. The ἐφύμνιον and ἀναφώνημα are mentioned by Hephæstion as among the number of those things, that determine, or mark the end of verses, τῶν διοριζόντων τὰ ποιήματα. P. 127.

It now remains for me to write, according to my original design, on the last syllable of the Sapphic strophe in the three verses, or colons rather, preceding the Adonic.

I shall assume it as a preliminary to any observations on this subject, that, as the Latins have copied their lyric poetry from Greek models, whatever *structure* of verse is exhibited in Latin, it may be referred to Greek usage, and considered as an authority for a similar structure in Greek.—From a careful examination, therefore, of the Latin Sapphics, the loss of the Greek Sapphics may in some measure be supplied, and the genuine laws, nature and division of the rhythm, even of the Greek Sapphic, may be ascertained. At the same time the converse of this proposition is by no means true, as will be shown presently, that whatever *structure* prevails in Greek the same is admissible in Latin, the genius of the Latin language obliging itself to more strictness and severity than were imposed on the Grecian muse. The preceding assumption too must be confined to the *structure* of verses, and does not extend to what regards *prosody*, as in this respect the Latin language has peculiarities not common to the Greeks, and in particular, as we have just seen, admits with almost equal facility the elision both of *long* and short vowels. The elisions which happen in this line of Catullus,

Frustra? imò magno cum pretio atque malo. Carm. 75. v. 2.

would be barbarous in Greek. The barytone nature of Latin pronunciation, excluding, as it does, all accent on the last syllable, may account for the weak nature of the long final vowels, and for their easy absorption into the succeeding word. It may be

collected, I think, from the fragments of Sappho, and still more plainly from the Sapphics of Catullus and Horace, that the whole strophe is to be considered as one line, divisible into three colons, consisting each of a ditrochee, a dactyl, and ditrochee, and concluding with an Adonic verse. Of these colons the two first always terminate in an entire word, but the third may either terminate in an entire word, or be joined to the Adonic at pleasure. It is a mistake that prevails almost universally, and I do not know a single modern writer of Greek or Latin Sapphics, who has not fallen into it, that the last syllable of each colon is so far common that it may end without offence in a *short* vowel before the next word having a vowel in the beginning. Thus in the Musæ Cantabrigienses, p. 138, there are in one strophe two examples of this improper hiatus,

Ἀλβάων κρύπτει νέφος· ὡς βρέμοισᾰ || ἐγγύθεν φοιτᾷ πολέμου
Θύελλᾰ, || ἔκλυον ὁμφᾶς.

The same too in Buchanan, Psalm 65.

Te manent laudes, Deus, in Sionĕ: || hìc tibi castis operata sacris || vota gens solvet tua, victimisquĕ || imbuet aras.

The accurate Burton of Eton has not quite escaped the contagion, for in him we find,

Flebilis captiva cohors tuiquĕ || O Sion dum corda recens subiret. Opusc. p. 14.

Prudentius also abounds in these negligences, for such I shall continue to call them in spite of his authority, opposed as they are to the *invariable* usage of Sappho, Catullus, Horace, and Statius. Not one of these poets, I believe, will furnish a single instance of such a hiatus. At the same time, of the very same hiatus at the end of the *strophe* it would be easy to multiply examples; but two shall suffice,

——— — ——— lumina noctĕ,
Otium Catulli etc. Cat. Carm. 49.
——— militiæque.
Unde si Parcæ etc. Hor. Lib. 2. Ode 6. v. 9.

We may consider it, therefore, as a rule that *this* hiatus between the colons ought to be avoided, and that, even in preference to this hiatus an elision is admissible.—As in Sappho,

Ἀλλὰ καμμὲν γλῶσσα ϝέϝαγε, λεπτὸν δ' || αὐτίκα, etc.

In Catullus,

Nullum amans vere sed identidem omnium || ilia rumpens. Carm. 11. v. 19.

In Horace,

Plorat, et vires animumque mores*que* || aureos, etc. Lib. 4. Ode 2. v. 22.

Catullus, indeed, has elided even a long vowel, in compliance with the genius of the Latin, as

Qui illius culpa cecidit velut prati || ultimi flos etc. Carm. 11. v. 22.

Another rule to be collected from usage is, that the two first colons are always to be kept distinct from each other, and from the succeeding colon, by terminating in a whole word. This is a rule which, I believe, has never been transgressed by the ancient poets. The junction, therefore, of the two first colons in the Musæ Cantab. p. 132.

Τὰν χλιδᾷ στίλβοισαν, ἵν' ἀ πνέοισ' ἀ- || ρώματ' Ἀὼς, etc.

seems a licence unsupported by any authority.

The third colon is distinguished from the preceding two by having appended to it an Adonic, as a close to the whole strophe. To this Adonic it is so united, that it does not require to be separated by a termination in a whole word, but often terminates in the middle of a word, and is by this means not destroyed, but rendered only less striking and perceptible, as in the much and unnecessarily tormented strophe,

——————— *καλοὶ δέ τ' ἄγον*
Ὠκέες στρῶθοι, πτέρυγας μελαίνας
Πύκνα δινήοντες ἀπ' ὠρανῶ αἰθέ- || ρος διὰ μέσσω.

The two stumbling-blocks in the way of commentators have been the Æolic form *δινήοντες* for *δινέοντες*, or *δινεῦντες*, and the difficulty to bring *ὠρανῶ αἰθέρος* into metre. I will not pretend to decide in what way the last syllable in *ὠρανῶ*, and the first in *αἰθέρος* are to be considered as forming together only one syllable, whether by an apocope of the initial diphthong of *αἰθέρος*, or by a crasis, like *ἐγῷδα*. Nevertheless, the fact, however it may be explained, is to my mind certain, that in *ὠρανῶ αἰθέρος*, the last syllable of the one, and the first syllable of the other, form together but one syllable, as in *ἐγὼ οὐδὲ* in another fragment of Sappho, and as in the Aristophanic *μὴ οὐ*, and the Homeric *Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀνδρειφόντῃ*. In all these instances the final long vowel, and the next initial vowel coalesce into one syllable. As the rhythm terminates with each strophe it is wholly inadmissible, and contrary to all authority to join two strophes together, as

——————— *ὡς ἴδον, ὡς ὤ-*
λοντο, μυθοποιὸς, etc. Musæ Cantab. p. 115.

Before I conclude my observations on the Greek Sapphic strophe, I will here apply it to the illustration of a strophe in the fragments of Alcæus. This strophe, like the Sapphic strophe, may be considered as one line, composed however of different colons, namely, two glyconian choriambs, and an iambic dipodia, by way of close. In the structure of this strophe, the different colons may all be tied together, and need not terminate in an

entire word, a licence which has thrown the chief obscurity over the true character of the metre. Mr. Gaisford (Hephæst. p. 313) enlists this metre among the antispastics, but it is more correctly distributed and analysed in the Museum Criticum, Vol. 1. p. 431. I will now put the strophe into my scale.

3 or 4	3	3	3		
Μαρμαί-	*ρει δὲ μέγας*		*δόμος*	3 or 4	3
χαλκῷ·	*πᾶσα δ' Ἄρῃ*		*κεκόσ-*	*μηται στέγη.*	

We may now perceive that the old readings *χάλκειαι δὲ πασσάλοι;* and *πὰρ δὲ Χαλκιδικαὶ* ought to be replaced, and that medical aid has been afforded where none was required. The twice intercalated *αὖ* has no other office to perform in both places than to produce uniformity, where uniformity is not demanded. Catullus abounds in similar inequalities in the same part of the *same metre*, as far as relates to the two first colons of this strophe, as

3 or 4		
Monti-	um domina ut	fores,
Sylva-	rumque viren-	tium, Carm. 32. v. 10.

Κυππαπίδες too for *Κυπαττίδες* is perfectly unnecessary.

In the above-mentioned strophe the glyconian is *followed* by an iambic dipodia, but in the line of Alcæus,

Κόλπῳ τ' ἐδέξ- ‖ αντ' ἀγ- ‖ ναὶ χά- ριτες ‖ κρόνω.

the order seems reversed, and an iambic dipodia is *prefixed* to the glyconian. Hephæstion, however, ranks this among the antispastics. See Gaisford's Hephæstion, p. 58, and note by Hotchkis. I will finish by giving a caution to the candidates for Sir William Browne's medal, a caution which some odes in the Musæ Cantabrigienses have not rendered quite unnecessary: namely, to abstain from the use of the dual number, whenever they write in the Æolic dialect. Dr. Valpy, in his Grammar, p. 6. 4th Edit. says, "the *dual*, which adds precision to the Greek language, is not used in the Æolic dialect."

I will now pass to a brief consideration of the Latin Sapphics as exhibited by Horace. Catullus has in a great measure imitated the freedom of the Greeks, but Horace has imposed upon his Muse the most severe restraints. To point out the chief of these is my present business.

The most striking difference between the versification of Sappho and Horace is the regular observation of the cæsura by the latter. This is invariably placed either on the first or second syllable of the dactyl, and exhibits only the two forms following,

Mercuri facunde | nepos Atlantis,
Qui feros cultus | hominum recentum.

The last form, as most agreeable, prevails the most. There are

many odes without an example of the dissyllabic, or trochaic cæsura. Statius too does not once admit it. No verse will be found in Horace without any cæsura in the dactylic foot, like this of Catullus,

Ultimi flos | prætereunte postquam.

Sarbievius, I think, generally observes the Horatian manner, but other modern poets have not been so fastidious, and Burton continually transgresses it, as

Dum tuos et | Cæciliæ magistræ. Opusc. p. 327.

Whenever Horace uses the trochaic cæsura, it occurs either on a trissyllable or quadrissyllable, as

Mercuri facunde | nepos Atlantis.
Fata donavere | bonique Divi.

The last form is only used once by Horace in all the four books of Odes, but this verse occurs in one of the most studied odes of the fourth book, and the same form is repeated no less than five times in the Carmen Sæculare, so that it appears to have had the sanction of his riper judgment.

There is a *solitary* example of the trochaic cæsura falling on a dissyllable, as

Semper ut te digna | sequare, et ultra. Lib. 4. Ode 11. v. 29.

Burton frequently makes use of this cæsura, as

O Sion, dum corda | recens subiret. Opusc. p. 14.

This is tolerable, but when he introduces a similar cæsura in the manner following,

Mistus unā, mista | fluit sonorum. Ib. p. 329.

it is quite another usage, and wholly unauthorized by Horace.

This assertion may appear at first sight hypercritical, but I have no doubt that it is true. Horace scrupulously avoids a pause at the fourth syllable, or termination of the trochaic measure, and therefore in the verse

Semper ut te digna | etc.

he makes a *monosyllable* precede *digna*, in order not to make it *necessary* to stop at *te*, but to give a good reader an opportunity of avoiding this pause by reading and dividing the metre in this manner,

Semper-ut te-digna | sequare et ultra.

So a good reader will read the verse of Catullus,

Ille mî par esse | Deo videtur,

not as if it were

Ille-mî-par esse | Deo videtur,

still less as if it were

Ille mî par | esse Deo videtur,

but as if it were like this of Horace,

Ille-mî par-esse | Deo videtur.

On the contrary in the verse

Mistus unà, mista fluit sonorum

there is no *possibility* of eluding the disagreeable pause at the end of the fourth syllable. Still notwithstanding the caution with which Horace has made a dissyllable sustain the cæsura, the practice, even with this caution, was never repeated by him, and may be considered as no sooner adopted than abandoned.

We may now perceive the reason why Horace, whenever the cæsura rests upon a *monosyllable*, makes *another monosyllable* precede it, as

Mercuri, nam-te | docilis magistro;

for by this means the pause may be made by a good reader at the third syllable, and the two monosyllables may be so coupled together as to resemble one dissyllable. The whole structure of the Horatian Sapphic is a piece of curious machinery, and the effect of the most elaborate art; and yet all this art has been so dexterously managed and well concealed, as to escape the notice of the most elegant and finished scholars, and of his most passionate admirers and imitators.—Horace seems to have been well aware that lyric poetry was the native plant of Greece, but was in Rome an exotic, that could be made to flourish only by the greatest care and attention. He has arrived at success by the only way in which it could be obtained; for in his hands the Latian Muse now appears no unworthy rival of the Grecian, and at least

Quamvis ingenio non valet, arte valet.

He is in lyrics what Ovid is in elegiacs, and what Virgil is in hexameters.

With respect to the hiatus of a short vowel at the end of each colon, Horace, I believe, never once admits of this licence, and adopts very sparingly the elision of such short vowel. The elisions that take place, all terminate in *que* or *um*, and, I think, there are only three of the first, and two of the latter. *Um* sometimes is not elided, as

Neve te nostris vitiis iniquum | ocyor aura. L. 1. O. 2. v. 48.

There are three more instances of *um* not elided. In Catullus on the contrary, the *um* at the end of a colon is uniformly elided, both in the Sapphic and choriambic strophe, as

Nullum amans verè, sed identidem omnium | ilia rumpens. Carm. 11.

Saltu- | umque recon- | ditorum
Amni- | umque, etc. Carm. 32.

The writers of Latin hexameters have sometimes retained the *m* final before a vowel without an elision, as

Nam quod fluvidum est e lævibus atque rotundis. Lucr. L. 2. v. 465.
Namque papaverum aura potest suspensa levisque. Ib. L. 3. v. 197.
Corvinum, et Galbam oculis nasoque carentem. Juv. Sat. 8. v. 5.
Jupiter ut Celtûm omne genus pereat. Cat. Carm. 64. v. 48.

But the last instance differs from the preceding, as the *um* final of Celtûm is long by nature, being a contraction of Celtarum, and in imitation of the Greek genitive Κελτῶν.

The conjunctions of the third colon with the Adonic are extremely rare, and the three following, I believe, are the only examples:

Labitur ripâ, Jove non probante ux- | orius amnis. L. 1. O. 2.
Grosphe, non gemmis, neque purpurâ ve- | nale, nec auro. L. 2. O. 16.
Pendulum zonâ bene te secutâ e- | lidere collum. L. 3. O. 27.

There is no instance in Horace of a conjunction at the *second* syllable of a word; for the verse

Thracio bacchante magis sub inter- | lunia vento. L. 1. O. 25.

may be an instance only of a compound word resolved.

In these conjunctions, as well as in the elisions of the final short vowel, one peculiarity is observable, that the last syllable of the colon is uniformly long, and that Horace admits, therefore, a trochee no more in the last part of the *final* ditrochee, than he does in the last part of the *first*. These verses of Sarbievius consequently,

Jam fluunt pronis tibi regna, Ferdi- | nande tributis. L. 2. O. 12.
Pertinax Euri furor, aut ineluc- | tabilis Austri. Epod. 6.
Sibilo ludas, lyrico comes Pŏ- | etria vati. L. 4. O. 27.

I will not say are without any authority, but cannot claim for their support the high authority of Horace. Such versification is disowned and rejected by him.

As the Latin language not only permits, but requires the elision of *long* vowels, it is proper to observe what course Horace has thought proper to pursue in the management of this affair, and where he is left without a guide by his Grecian masters. For the most part he avoids the elision of long vowels altogether. When an elision does happen, it is either at the end of a colon before the monosyllable *et* or *in*, or in the middle of a colon upon some syllable that is required to be *long*. I believe, there are but four instances of the one sort of elision, and but three of the other, namely,

Plena miraris positusque carbŏ̄ in. L. 3. O. 3.
Dona præsentis rape lætus horǣ et. Ib.
Sentiant motus orientis Austrī̄ et. L. 3. O. 27. v. 22.
Dedit iratæ, lacerare ferrŏ̄ et. Ib. v. 46.
Quisquis ingentes oculŏ̄ irretorto. L. 2. O. 2. v. 23.
Arsit Atreides mediŏ̄ īn triumpho. L. 2. O. 4. v. 7.
Sic lucrŏ̄ āversam potuisse nasci. Ib. O. 3. v. 7.

The long vowel we have seen elided also, at the end of a colon, and where the colon is combined with the Adonic, in the verse

Pendulum zonâ bene te secutâ ē- | lidere collum.

There is, I submit, in none of these instances, any defence for the elision which occurs in this verse of Naugerius,

Quod sī ita tanges, fera ut obstinatum. Poem. Select. Ital. P. 145.

I now proceed to the consideration of the Greek Alcaic under the three heads, as before, of rhythm, hiatus, and the condition of the last syllable in each verse, or colon rather, of the strophe. The rhythm then of the two first colons of the Greek Alcaic seems to be derived from the Sapphic, and to be no other than the same rhythm more artificially disposed, having a syllable prefixed, and in return being catalectic in the end, as

	3	3 or 4	2	2	3	
Ὑ-	ει μιν	ὀ Σδεὺς,	ἐκ δ'	ὀρα-	νῶ μέ-	γας
Χει	μῶν' πε-	πάγα-	σιν δ'	ὑδά-	των ῥο-	αί.
Τὸ	μὲν γὰρ	ἔνθεν	κῦ-	μα κυ-	λίνδε-	ται
Πὰρ	μὲν γὰρ	ἄντλος	ἰσ-	τοπέ-	δαν ἔχ-	ει.

A syllable prefixed to any metre, like a broken or imperfect bar in modern music, has an abrupt mode of beginning well calculated to inspire animation. It seems on this account to have been introduced in many metres, and is rather a note of preparation than a foot, and may generally be either long or short at pleasure. The same metre occurs in the fragments of Alcæus without the syllable prefixed, as

Ἀλλ' ἀνήτω | μὲν περὶ | ταῖς θέραις.

It is then a Sapphic colon, catalectic.

Every colon has either a diæresis at the end of the first ditrochæus, as

Προ- | κόψο- μες γὰρ ‖ οὐ- δὲν ἀ- | σάμε- νοι.

or a cæsura on the first syllable of the dactyl, as

Κάβ- | βαλλε τὸν χει- | μῶν' ‖ ἐπὶ | μὲν τι- θείς.

or thirdly a diæresis at the end of the dactyl, as

Τὸ | Γέργον [ἀλλ'] ἀ- | γή- σατο ‖ τεὰ κό- ρα.

Horace, as we shall see presently, has imitated all three modes of division.

The next colon in the Alcaic strophe seems to be a trochaic dimeter acatalectic, with a syllable prefixed, as

	3	3 or 4	3	3 or 4
Ὦ	Βύκχι	φάρμα-	κον δ' ἄ-	ριστον
Τὸ	δ' ἔνθεν	ἄμμες δ'	ἀν τὸ	μέσσον.

The last colon admits of no variety of times, but is restricted to two dactyls succeeded by a ditrochee, as

Ναὶ φο- | ρήμεθα | σὺν μελαίνᾳ.

The most agreeable form of this colon is when the dactylic and trochaic rhythms are not kept distinct as in the preceding example, but tied together by a word in common, as

Καὶ λακί- | δες μεγά- | λαι κατ' αὐτό. |

With respect to the hiatus, there is no doubt that it is admissible in the dactylic feet of this metre, as

Ἄνδρες πόλεος πύργοι ἀρήιοι.

But whether a hiatus is equally admissible in the trochaic feet is very doubtful, and on this account the alteration of προτέρῳ 'νέμῳ into προτέρῳ ὁμὸν made in the Museum Criticum, Vol. I. p. 424, is perhaps objectionable.

As the Latin Alcaic strophe in all that regards its structure is a faithful copy of the Greek, I will reserve any observations to be made on the condition of the last syllable of each colon, till I come to treat of it in the Latin Alcaics. By this means not only tautology will be avoided, but the subject may be better elucidated by examples, of which we feel the want in Greek. It is to Horace, and to his ardent admiration of Alcæus, that we are chiefly indebted for our knowledge of the Alcaic metre.

The properties of the Latin Alcaic strophe have been so well explained by an ingenious and accurate writer, in the Classical Journal, No. 22, p. 351, that little more is necessary than to refer to him for a full knowledge of this hitherto ill-understood and neglected metre. He has not only the merit of explaining successfully the Alcaic strophe, but has set an example in the mode of doing so, which may be applied to the elucidation of all other metres. Until we know more than we do at present about the principles and theory of ancient rhythmopœia, it is chiefly by attention to the practice of the best poets, by a strict examination of their versification, and by the laborious process of analysing its forms, that we are most likely to make progress in metrical science.

I shall now proceed in the course I have hitherto pursued, and begin with the consideration of the rhythm, which prevails in the Latin Alcaics. This is similar in all respects to the Greek, except that Horace has imposed on his Muse a greater uniformity and strictness. In one place, and in one place only, I believe, he admits a pure ditrochee in the first colon.

Si non pĕrīrĕt immiserabilis
Captiva Pubes; Lib. 3. O. 5.

And in another place,

Jam Dædaleo ocyor Icaro. L. 2. O. 20.

he retains the long *o* without an elision after the Greek fashion.

These deviations from his general rule of versification take place at the end of the trochaic measure, and where a licence, as less perceptible, is most excusable; nor does there seem a necessity for a change in the reading. Otherwise we might read with Bentley, *tutior* for *ocyor*, and *perirent* might be substituted for *periret*. It is by no means an infallible ground of objection to a particular verse, that its form occurs only once, as the forms of the five following verses are all of them different, and yet occur but once.

Mentemque lymphatam Mareotico
Spectandus in certamine Martio
Hostile aratr*um* exercitus insolens
Antehac nefas de- promere Cæcubum
Utrumque nostr*um* in-credibili modo

The first is an instance of the cæsura on the first syllable of the dactyl.

The second is an instance of the diæresis at the end of the dactyl.

The third is similar to the second, with the addition of an elision, at the place where the trochaic measure terminates.

The fourth line has its diæresis in the proper place, according to the Horatian rule, but in a singular manner, that is at the preposition in a compounded word.

The fifth line is in a similar predicament, with the addition of an elision.

With the exception of the preceding lines, all the two first colons of Horace are marked with a pause or diæresis at the end of the trochaic measure.

The infrequency of deviation from this rule observable in all the books of Horace is a sufficient argument against the too common deviation from it, especially when it is considered that every deviation in Horace from the established rule is confined to the first colon, and is never permitted on the second.—The irregularity in the first colon is thus compensated by a quick return in the second colon to the proper, and more agreeable rhythm. It becomes then, as it were, a fault recovered, and, like a discord artfully introduced in music, leaves the ear, after a slight shock, more sensible of the harmony that follows. There is no authority in Horace for a couplet like this,

Aut qua sonanti pectine Pindarus
Argenteæ testudinis impulit. Musæ Cantab. P. 5.

What makes the last colon still more prosaic is the quadrissyllable at the beginning which is only admissible when followed by a monosyllable, so as to fall into the regular diæresis, or pause, as

Sermonibus te negligit horridus. L. 3. O. 21. v. 10.

Modern Poets have introduced a fourth pause in this colon, quite unused by Horace, and that is a *dissyllabic* cæsura,

Insaniâ, quandoque | tumultuans. Musæ Cantab. P. 7.
Terrarum ad usque extrema | furentibus. Ib. P. 100.
Subrideatque Ætnea | Proserpina. Milton (Newton's) v. 2. P. 338.

Horace frequently makes the pause rest upon a monosyllable, as

Hoc caverat mens | provida Reguli. L. 3. O. 5. v. 13.

and not unfrequently on a *weak* monosyllable after an *elision*, as

Jamdudum apud *me* est, | eripe te moræ. L. 3. O. 29. v. 5.
Descende *cælo* et | dic age tibia. L. 3. O. 4. v. 1.
Drusum gerentem et | Vindelici quibus. L. 4. O. 4. v. 18.
Aurum *irrepertum* et | sic melius situm. L. 3. O. 3. v. 49.

In the fourth book the pause so made is found but once. Sometimes the pause falls upon an elided syllable, as

Armenta non *aurum* | aut ebur Indicum. L. 1. O. 31. v. 5.
Quo Styx et *invisi* | horrida Tænari. L. 1. O. 34. v. 10.
Regum *timendorum* | in proprios greges. L. 3. O. 1. v. 5.
Primum *inquinavere* | et genus et domos. L. 3. O. 6. v. 18.

There is no instance of an elision falling upon a monosyllable, as in this line of Buchanan,

Sic ille nuper spe | insatiabili. Miscell. Ode 8.

In the fourth book Horace has refrained entirely from the use of this mode of making the pause.—So true is it, that Horace to the last endeavoured to give the highest finish to his imitations of the Greek lyrics.

The third verse of the Alcaic strophe is in Greek a colon of great laxity, but is, as usual, in Horace most artificial and exact. In the first place, here, as in the Sapphic, the pure ditrochee is excluded, and the last syllable is uniformly long, as

De- | præli- antes | nec cu- pressi.

An Iambic penthimemer (for such at least it is in appearance) is prohibited at the beginning, unless it be *succeeded* by a monosyllable, and the same is prohibited at the end, unless it be *preceded* by a monosyllable, as

Te belluosus | qui || remotis. L. 4. O. 14. V. 47.
Ab se removisse, | et || virilem. L. 3. O. 5. v. 43.
De gente | sub | Dio || moreris. L. 2. O. 3. v. 23.
Consulque | non | unius || anni. L. 4. O. 9. v. 39.

Horace has admitted a dissyllable eight times, and a quadrisyllable three times, *after* the penthimemer, but has admitted but once a hypermonosyllable *before* the penthimemer, as

Hunc Lesbio | sacrare || plectro. L. 1. O. 26. v. 11.

These examples occur wholly in the first and second books, and never in the third and fourth. Instead of a monosyllable, a dissyllable with an elision may *precede* the penthimemer, as

In majus | idem | odere || vires,

but *after* a Penthimemer, a dissyllable with an elision is not admissible. The line therefore of Buchanan,

Salve vetustæ | vitæ || imago, Miscell. Od. 11.

does not rest on good authority.

An Iambic Penthimemer, comprehended in a single word, may *begin* this colon, but is forbidden at the end of it.

Nevertheless in the Musæ Anglicanæ, such a final Penthimemer occurs,

Fulgeret | atque | augustiore, v. 1. p. 139. Strop. 13.

J. B. M.

GRYPHIADÆA.

Τι γαρ, τολμηρε, κυναγεις; *Bion. Id. α'.* 60.

Ωφελησονται δε οἱ επιθυμησαντες τουτου του εργου πολλα· ὑγιειαν τε γαρ τοις σωμασι παρασκευασουσι, και ὁρᾶν και ακουειν μαλλον, γηρασκειν δε ἡττον· τα δε προς τον πολεμον μαλιστα παιδευει.

Xenoph. Cyneget. XII. 1.

Βιβλιον Α. Ὑποθεσις.

Ἑταιροις συμποσιαν παρασκευαζων Γρυφιαδης, ἑαυτου ἱππον επαινει· Βαλιος δε και Γρυφιαδης διαλεγονται, και αλληλοις περι ταχυτητος ἱππων εριζουσιν· αυτους δε καταπαυει Βασσαφιος, τον οινον εγκωμιαζων. Οἱ δε το λοιπον της ἡμερας εις οινοποσιαν τρεπονται. Νυκτος δε επιγενομενης, Γρυφιαδης καθευδει· ὁ δε ὡρας κατα μεσονυκτιας εξυπνιζεται, ὡστε αιθερος καταστασιν προπυθανεσθαι· ἡλιου δε ανατελλοντος, εξ οικου πορευεται. Μαρθη δε, απαγγελλουσα τα παρα ποταμου πραττομενα, εθελει Γρυφιαδην της θηρας αποτρεπειν. Γρυφιαδης δε, χολωσαμενος, διαλοιδωρειται Μαρθῃ, και εις την θηραν απερχεται.

ΑΝΔΡΑ φιλον θελγων επεσιν, φιλοθηρον αειδω,
Εσθλον, αεθλοφορον, μεγαλων πρηκτηρα τε εργων·
Ητοι ὁγ' εν θηρῃ μετα πασι μετεπρεφ' ἑταιροις·
Τον δ' οἱ θαυμαζον· μαλ' ὁ θαρσαλεως ἱππευεν,
Αρχων· αυταρ ὁ τοισιν αφειλετ' αοιδιμον ευχος. 5
ΓΡΥΦΙΑΔΗΣ, ἑταροις παρεχων μενοεικεα δαιτα,
Ἱππον πτηνον ἑον περι παντων εμμεναι αλλων
Ευχετο κυδιοων· ὁ δε καγχαλοων επος ηυδα·
Κεκλυτε μευ, πεπονες, και ακουετε, παντες ἑταιροι,
Οφρ' ειπω ποιος θηρῃ ενι μοι θρασυς ἱππος, 10
Πτηνος, ανικητος· του δ' αντ' απερεισι' αποινα

V. 4. Od. σ. 420. V. 5. Od. α. 9. V. 11. Il. α. 111.

Ουκ εθέλω δεξασθαι, επει πολυ βουλομαι αυτον
Σταθμω εχειν κρι λευκον ερεπτομενον και ολυρας.
Σημερον ὁ Σνῆδος μ' εκαλεσσατο ἡν επι θηρην·
Κεκλημαι δε και αυτος επαυριον, ουδε τις αλλος·
Σνῆδος δ' ου τρεφει ἱππον εϋξεστῳ επι φατνῃ
Φερτερον ἡμετερου, ταχεες καν Σνῆδιοι ἱπποι·
Ου μεν Βυττιαδης τοιον Σουθαμιον, ου μεν
Τοιον Βᾳλιος ἱππον εοις ὑψαυχενα φερβει
Σταθμοις, οἱον εγω κυαμους κριθην τε φαγοντα.
Ὡς εφαθ'· οἱ δ' αρα παντες ακην εγενοντο σιωπῃ·
Τον δ' αυ Βᾳλιος οιος αμειβομενος προσεειπεν.
Ω πεπον ου κατα μοιραν επος μεταμωλιον ειπες·
Ου γαρ νηφαλεον πρεπει ουτως ευχεταασθαι,
Ηε φιλων ἱππους ονοταζειν, ὁν δ' ὑπεραινειν·
Ει δε δοκει τεος ἱππος εμου τοι φερτερος ειναι,
Κερματα νυν χρυσου καταθησομεθ', ὁσσ' εθελησῃ,
Πεντ', η πεντηκοντ', η πλειον', εμοι τα συ τισεις
Αυριον, ει μη γ' ουραν αλωπεκος εξαρπαξεις.
Ὡς φατο· Γρυφιαδης δ' αρ' ανιστατο μυθον ακουσας,
Πεντε νομισματα νει' ενι χειρι τριδακτυλῳ ισχων·
(Του γαρ ὑπο νιτρου ποθ' ὑπερραγη εν χερι χαλκος
Βομβηδον, πυρος αυθ' ενα δακτυλον εἰλ' ολοη ις.)
Λαμπεσθην δε οἱ οσσε λιλαιομενῳ περιδοσθαι·
Αλλ' ου τοιος εων ελαθεν, πινοντα περ εμπης,
Βασσαφιον πολυμητιν, ὁ μιν κατερεξε και ειπεν·
Αλλα, φιλοι, τα τετυχθαι εασομεν· εστι γαρ ὡρη
Αλλη μεν θηρης, αλλη μελιηδεος οινου·
Αυριον ἱπποσυνης ξυνης μνησωμεθα· νυν δ' αυ
Νεκταρ αφυσσοντες τερπωμεθα· ειδετε, παντες,
Ὡς απο κρητηρος λαμπει καθαρου σελας ἡδυ
Οινου ακεσσιπονοιο χυσει ενι κινυμενοιο·
Ει ταδε Γρυφιαδῃ τοσσον μελει, ὑδροποτειτο·
Χαιρε δ', εμοι, οινε, στυγερης αποπαυμα μεριμνης,
Οφθαλμε τριποθητε περιπλομενων ενιαυτων,
Χαρμα βροτοις ενωδες, αριστης μητερ αοιδης,
Θυμῳ πενθαλεῳ δωρων χαριεστατε παντων,
Ηρεμα γαρ δυνασαι πεπιθειν φρενας αχνυμενων περ.
Ὡς φατο Βασσαφιος· μειδησε δε οινοχοευων·

V. 13. Il. ε. 195. V. 21. Il. γ. 95. V. 23. Il. α. 286. V. 35. Il. ξ. 1.

Σπενδε δ' αρ' ην πυθεεν μαλα παρθενῳ ἱμεροεντι,
Κοττονιοιο θυγατρι, φιλομμειδῃ, φιλομολπῃ,
Ωμους καλλιστῃ βηταρμοσιν εν κουρῃσιν.
Οἱ δ' επιον παντες, ὁσον ηθελε θυμῳ ἑκαστος,
Ὑγρον κλαζοντες μελος, ηδ' αδινον γελοωντες·
Αλλος μεν προκαλιζετ' αμοιβαιοις κυλικεσσιν
Ἡλικας· ευφροσυνῃ δε γεγηθως αμφι τραπεζῃ
Αλλος ερωμανεων επεων επιτερπετ' ακουῃ.
Αλλ' ὁτε δη γαιαν νυκτος κνεφας αμφικαλυψεν,
Γρυφιαδης στρωτοισιν ενι λεχεεσσι καθευδεν,
Ψευστῃ παμπολλας κουρας φιλεων εν ονειρῳ,
Η κυνας οτρυνων· θηρῃ δ' αρα πολλα εἴκτον.
Ουδε διαμπερες ευδ', αταρ ὡς κ' ενι νυκτος αμολγῳ
Εγρετ' αρ εξ ὑπνου, θυριδος δια χειρ' ανατεινων·
Δειδιε γαρ μη παχνη επαυριον ισχανῃ εργον
Πηγυλις, η νιφετος βορεου νεφεα κλονεοντος·
Ου μεν αν ὡδε δυναιατ' αλωπεκος ιχνι' ερευνᾶν
Ῥεια κυνες· φθινυθει γαρ αλωπεκιην κρυος οδμην·
Αλλ' ουτ' εκ νεφεων πιπτεν νιφας· ου κρυος ηεν·
Αυραι δ' αμβροσιαι θερμαι πνεον· αἱ δ' αρ' εθειραι
Ἡδυ μαλ' εσσειοντο του εξω δερκομενοιο
Νυκτα καθ' ἱμεροεσσαν ὑπο ζεφυροιο ιωης·
Παντα δ' αρ' εν σιγῃ κεατο ζωὸν· ηδε Σελῃνη
Γρυφιαδεω εσιδοντος ἑης ερατον ῥοον αυγης
Χευατο κακκεφαλης, χαριεν δε προσωπον αγαλλε·
Βῃ δ' αν' ὁγ' ες θαλαμον χεχαρισμενος εν φρεσιν ἡσιν.
Αμφι δε μιν θειοιο παλιν χεχυθ' ὑπνου αωτον.
Αυταρ ὁτ' ηελιου φαος ηγαγεν ἱλαον ημαρ,
Μηκεθ' ὁγ' ευναζεν μαλακῳ δεδμημενος ὑπνῳ·
Κραιπνα δ' αρ' ὑψ' ανορουσ', εν δ' εἱματα σιγαλοεντα
Δυνε μαλ' ασπασιως, και σηρικον αμφ' ὑπο δειρῃ
Καλον βομβυκινον θετο, ποικιλον, αιολοβαπτον,
Δωρον ἑης κασιος πολυκεστον Πηνελοπειης·
Αμφι δ' επειτ' ευθημον εεσσατο δερμ' ελαφοιο,
Αμφοτερους μηρους ἁρμοστον, ὁ οἱ καμε ῥαπτων
Σκυτοτομων οχ' αριστος, αει κουραις φιλον ειναι·

V. 54. Oppian. Halieut. β. 412.
V. 64. Od. ξ. 470. Hesiod. Op. Di. β. 112.

Κνημιδας μεν επειτα περι κνημῃσιν εδεκτο·
Κρατι δ' επ' ιφθιμῳ πιλον νεοπηκτον εθηκε,
Κοπτομενον κατοπισθ', αταρ εκτασις ην οἱ προσθεν·
Φοινικοεν τ' εσθος περονησατο· γεντο δ' ἱμασθλην
Καλην, αργυρεην, ἡν Κρουθηρος τυχεν αυτος· 90
Εκ θαλαμων δ' ὡς γαμβρος εβησατο, κυδεϊ γαιων,
Ποσσιν εριγδουποις μακρα σταθμονδε βιβασθων.
Τον δ' αρ' ιοντ' ενοησεν αφαρ λιπαρων προ θυραων
Γρηϋς κληϊφερη, θαλαμηπολος, ηδε μαγειρος,
Οἱσιν ενι μεγαροισιν ονειροπολων παναριστη, 95
Ἡν χρηστος Μαρθην κικλησκε δι' ευφημισμον
Αυτος Γρυφιαδης· αλλοι δε φιλοι Μαριθορνην·
Ἡ μεν Γρυφιαδεω περιμηδετο εν φρεσιν ἡσιν·
Ισα δ' ἑῳ μιν παιδ' εφιλει· και γαρ το παρος περ
Πολλακι, τυτθος ετι, γρηος επι γουνασιν εὑδεν, 100
Κουροσυνῃ πεπλον καταδευων φερτατον αυτης·
Τῃ δ' αρα εργα γελαστα, και ου μαλ' αραι', εμογησε·
Ἡ νυ τῳ αντιη ηλθε, παρισταμενη δε προσηυδα·
Τιπτ' επι λευγαλεην εθελεις, φιλε δεσποτα, θῃρην
Νωλεμεως ιεναι; νυν δ' αυτω μιμν' ενι οικῳ· 105
Οφρα πονον τε, κοπον τε, και αλγεα πολλ' αλεοιο.
Πολλα γαρ αλγε' εχουσιν ενι θῃρῃ αλεγεινῃ
Ανδρες ὑπερθυμοι, τοις ἱπποσυνην συ μεγαιρεις,
Νηπιος, ουδε νοεις (μαλα κ' ει σχεδον ηματι παντῃ
Ανδρασιν ἱπποκροτοις) θανατον και κηρα μελαιναν. 110
Ει δ' αυ βουλευεις κατατερπεσθαι φιλον ητορ,
Τεσσαρες αἱ σφαιραι τοι διπλακες, ευτροχαλοι τε,
Ενδον συν νευρῃσιν ὁμου κεαται ενι κλισμῳ·
Των αρα τρεις, πυξοιο κλαδον τεμνων, Λοριωτης
Ευ και επισταμενως χερσιν καμε, την δε τεταρτην, 115
Πολλα χαριζομενος τοι, εϋπριστου ελεφαντος·
Τῃν, δυο ῥαβδι' ἑλων πυκινως επαρηροτα νευρῃ,
Δινωτην στροφαλιζ', ηχον γλυκυν εξαναγειρων
Σφαιρης εκ γλαφυρης· μαλα δ' ὡδε σαωτερος εσση.
Αλλ' ει μητ' εθελεις πειθεσθαι μηθ' ὑπακουειν, 120
Μητ' ετι μαντευης εμπαζεαι ἡντινα ῥησω,
Δειμαινω μη τοι τι επισπαστον κακον ελθῃ·

V. 86. Il. λ. 17. V. 87. Il. γ. 336.

Χθες γαρ απο ῥινοιο, κακου τρια σηματ', εραΐζε
Προσθε ποδων εμεων ψιαδες πεσον αἱματοεσσαι·
Η και τις πρωΐζα κυων ποταμοιο παρ' οχθας
Χηνα τεον φθονεροισι γεραιτατον εκταν' οδουσιν·
Τον μεν κραυγαζοντα σαωζειν εμμεμαυια
Ου δυναμην· κειται δε μυλαις παρα μακρα τανυσθεις,
Εισιδεειν δεινον· κορακες δε δη αμφιμαχονται
Γυμνου· αταρ τα πτιλα τεω ενι ῥηγεϊ θησω.
Οιδα δ' αρ' οιωνους, εσθλους τε, κακους τε, βροτοισιν
Κληρον σημαινουσ' εμε δ' αιδεο, ὡς σε σαωσῃς.
Ὡς φατο κινησασα καρη γρηϋς πυκιμηδης.
Την δ' αρα Γρυφιαδης προσεφωνεε και μετεειπεν·
Μαντι κακων, βαρυμυθε, βριηπυε, νικει αριστη,
Τιπτ' αει ατρεκεως λαβρευεαι ου κατα μοιραν;
Η ουχ' ἁλις ὁττι παρος περ ονειρατα πολλ' αγορευες,
Εξ αυτοσχεδιης τεκταινομενη φρεσι μυθους;
Αυτη δ' ὡς οφελες κορακεσσιν εδεσμα γενεσθαι.
Νυν δ' ες οικον ιουσα, καθεζομενη δε καμινῳ,
Ασβολῳ, εικ' εθελεις, μαντευεο αμφιπολοισιν,
Αἱ δειλαι τρομεουσ' απατηλια φασματα νυκτος.
Πριν δε ταδ' εκτελεειν, πλακοεντα ζιγγιβεριτην
Πατροκασιγνητος αρτον γλυκυν, οκταβλωμον,
Δος μοι εχειν· ει γ' ὡς κεντρον λιμοιο φυγοιμι,
Η τινι πειναοντι διδοιμ' ολιγην περ εδωδην.
Ὡς εφατ', ουδ' απιθησε γυνη ταμιη πυκιμηδης·
Βλωμιλιον δε διδου πλακοεντα ζιγγιβεριτην·
Βη δε δομονδ' ιεναι· κακα δ' εν φρεσι μερμηριζε.
Αν δ' αυ Γρυφιαδης μεγαλοφρων βησατο ἱππον,
Λυχενος ὑψιλοφου επαφωμενος ἁλματι κουφῳ·
Βη δ' ιεναι μεμαως· μαλα γαρ ποθεεσκεν αϋτην
Ανδρων ηδε κυνων· ενι δεξιτερῃ δ' αρ' ἱμασθλην
Ἡστο κραδαινομενος παυθυμαδον, ἡ ῥ' ἱμασ' ἱππον.
Τον δ' αρα νισσομενον θυριδων δια τηλοθ' ιδουσα,
Κουρη τις φιλεεσκεν επαξιον· ες δε κελευθον
Παπτηνεν· τρεμε δ' αιεν εελδομενη περ ιδεσθαι·
Λοξα δ' οπιπτευεσκεν αμηχανος· ενδοθι δ' ητορ
Ειβετο τηκομενῃ· του δ' ὡς ηντησεν οπωπην
Θαμβησεν· θερμον δ' εκαλυψατο χειρι παρειην.

V. 123. Scut. Herc. 383. et Il. π. 459. V. 129. Il. σ. 18.

Τὴν δ' ὀγ' ἐπιστροφάδην ησπαζετο· κλεπτοσυνῃ δε
Μειδησεν, χρυσεων πλοκαμων απο πιλον αειρας·
Εκ βλεφαρων δ' ερος ειβετ' επικλοπος αυτου ιοντος·
Πυρ μεν κρυπταδιον τερενα χρο' ὑπεδραμε κουρης·
Ἑζετο δ' αμφασιῃ· θυμος δε ῑ̓ εκπεποτητο. 165
Ὡς τε περι ξανθῳ κροκῳ, ηδ' ἰῳ, ηδ' ὑακινθῳ
Πυκνῳ και μαλακῳ, (τα τ' ἀρα χθων ανθεα τικτει
Χωρῳ εν ὑληενθ', ὁ̓ι επι σκεπας εστ' ανεμοιο,)
Σκιδναται ηελιοιο ὑπ' αυγης ειαρος ερση·
Ὡς ῑ̓ ενι στηθεσσιν ιαινετο θυμος, ὑπ' αυγης 170
Κραατος ερχομενοιο, τοιη δε μιν αμφεχυτ' αιγλη.
Αλλ' ετι Γρυφιαδῃ πυκιναι φρενες αφθιτοι ησαν·
Ου νυ γαμων φροντιζεν αθικτος· του δ' ἀρα πολλαι
Λαχνην ῆρησαντο παρειαων ἁπαλαων
Κουραι ψηλαφααν, λευκον τ' επι δακτυλον ισχειν. 175
Ἡ δ' οἱ ενι πραπιδεσσιν αριστη φαινετο βουλη,
Οιον προσθ' αλλων μεμαωτ' ιεναι κατα θηρην.
Ῥεια γαρ αἱρησειν φῃ αλωπεκος αιολοβουλης
Ουρανι, αγων θηρης ὑπατον κλεος ὁνδε δομονδε·
Νηπιος, οὐνεκ' εμελλεν εχειν μεγα πημα, γελαστον 180
Ταφρῳ ὑπ' ιλυος κεκαλυμμενος, ου κατα κοσμον.

Βιβλιον Β. Ὑποθεσις.

Γρυφιαδης ἑταιρων εν ὁμιλῳ τους εν τῃ θηρᾳ αριστευοντας εις αγωνα προκαλειται. Αγωνιζονται δε Βαλιος και Γρυφιαδης· και πολλα παθων εν τῃ θηρᾳ Γρυφιαδης, διασωθεις, ουραν αλωπεκος, το της αρετης αθλον εν μεσῳ κειμενον, εχει, αποφερει.

Αλλ' ὁτ' αγηνοριῃ τε και ἱπποσυνῃφι πεποιθως
Ηλθεν ὁπου ταχεες τε κυνες θαλεροι τ' αιζηοι
Κλαγγηδον κτυπεοντες ὁμιλαδον εστιχοωντο,
Γρυφιαδης εξαυτις ιων πρωτοισιν εμιχθη· 185
Τοισι δ' επευχομενος επεα πτεροεντα προσηυδα·
Βουλομαι, ω πεπονες, μαλα δῃ τ' εμε θυμος αναγει
Λιεν ενι θηρῃ κυνας οτρυνειν· δυναμαι γαρ·
Ει και δῃ φλογι ισοι αολλεες ηε θυελλῃ

V. 165. Apollon. Rhod. Argon. γ. 810.
V. 166. Argon. γ. 1018. V. 189. Il. ν. 39.

Οδμῃ θεσπεσιῃ αμοτον μεμαωτες ἑπονται.
Αλλα, φιλοι, νυν παντες εγειρετε μωνυχας ἱππους
Νωλεμεως θειοντας ὁμιλαδον, οφρα ἰδωμεν
Οἱοι φερτεροι ἱπποι εναντιοι αλληλοισι
Θειειν η θορεειν· αλλ᾽ ου τινος ἱππον οἴω
Τουτον νικησειν· αιει δ᾽ αρ᾽ οπισθεν εσεσθαι.
Ὡς φατο τραυλιζων λιγεως, επει ου ταχυμυθος.
Ὡς δ᾽ απολην᾽ επεων, κυνες ἠδυν ὑλαγμον ιαλλον
Ὑλης εν βησσῃσιν αλωπεκιην δι᾽ αὔτμην·
Ῥεια δε θηρευτῃσιν εριγνωτος γενετ᾽ ηχος·
Ουδ᾽ αρ᾽ ατερ σπουδης ὀν εφιππιον αλλος ερειδεν,
Πυξ η οδαξ τελαμωνα λαβων, αταρ αλλος ες ὑλην
Παπτηνεν· γλυκυ τι κραδιῃ δ᾽ αρα παλλεθ᾽ ἑκαστῳ.
Ουδ᾽ εδυναντ᾽ εθελοντες αλωπεκα παντες ἰδεσθαι·
Πρωτος Γρυφιαδης δ᾽ ιαχῃ σημηνεν, ὁτ᾽ εγνω
Ουραν τεινομενην ειδων κρυβδην απιουσης.
Ασβεστος δε κυνων ὁμαδος γενεθ᾽ ὑλακομωρων
Ὡς ἰαχοντ᾽ ενοησαν αγακλυτον ορχαμον ανδρων·
Φθογγος εγερσινοων κερατων ἁμα χευετ᾽ ατειρες·
Ηχω δ᾽ αντεβοησ᾽ ἑπταστομος· ἡ δ᾽ αρ᾽ αρουρα
Ἱλαρον αυ λελαχεν· βεβρυχε δε βυσσοθεν ὑλη
Παντῃ ὑπο κλαγγης· μυκημα δ᾽ αρ᾽ αιθερ᾽ ἰκανεν.
Γρυφιαδης δε μενος κρατερῳ ενι κατθετο θυμῳ·
Ἱππον δ᾽ αυ λυσεν· μαλα δ᾽ ἠθελον αυτῳ ἑπεσθαι
Φαιδιμος Ὀλλινος, χαλεπου τ᾽ ακορητος αεθλου
Βαλιος, ου τελεων ἀ ενι φρεσι μερμηριζει.
Γρυφιαδης δ᾽ εξαυτις ιων λιπε παντας αριστους,
Οξεα κεκληγως κυνας στρυνειν δι᾽ αρουραν·
Φωνην γαρ προεηκε βοων δια χειρος ααπτου.
Ανδρων δ᾽ ορνυμενων ὁμαδος ην· ἠδε τε πολλοι
Πρηνεις τ᾽ εν κονιῃσι και ὑπτιοι εκπεσον ἱππων·
Πολλα δε εἵματα καλα παλασσετο· οἱ δ᾽ ara πιλοι
Κραιπνα κυλινδομενοι πνοιῃσ᾽ ανεμοιο πετοντο.
Ὡς ῥ᾽ ισαν εν θηρῃ χεχαρισμενοι, αλλοπροσαλλοι·
Ηρχε δε Γρυφιαδης· του Βαλιος αιεν οπισθεν
Ἑσπετο καρπαλιμως, χευεν δ᾽ αρ᾽ ατειρεα φωνην·
Ὅς ῥα κυνων αιει τον οπιστατον, οφρ᾽ αν εφευροι,
Νεικεσσε, σπυταλον κραδαων βοος· οἱ δ᾽ εφεβοντο.

V. 196. Il. γ. 213.

Αλλ᾽ ότε δη ταφροιο βαθειης έρκος ικοντο
Διστοιχει γλαφυρης, τοτε δη δειδισσετο θυμῳ
Γρυφιαδης, αγαθος περ εων, ὁ δ᾽ αρ᾽ ενὶ᾽ ανεμιμνεν
Βᾳλιον ερχομενον· τῳ δ᾽ αυ προς μυθον εειπε·
Ω φιλε, δη νυν αμμε παλιμπλαγχθεντας οϊω
Αψ᾽ απονοστησειν· τις δ᾽ αν δια ταφρον ικοιτο;
Αλλα και ευρει᾽ εστι, μαλ᾽ αργαλεη τε περησαι·
Παμπολλαι γαρ ακανθαι ιδε σκολοπες περι πασαν
Οξεες έστασιν, χαλεποι, και δυσβατοι ίπποις.
Τον δ᾽ αρ᾽ ὑποδρα ιδων προσεφωνεε Βᾳλιος αιθων·
Ειθ᾽ ὡς τοι θρασυς ίππος, αει θηρης τ᾽ ακορητος,
Ὡς τοι θυμος έποιτο ενι στηθεσσι φιλοισιν,
Αρρηκτος τε βιη· νυν δ᾽, ὦγαθε, που τοι απειλαι
Ανδρασι τας φιλεοισιν ὑπεσχεο ὑδροποταζων,
Ουδενα θηρητηρα τεον γ᾽ ίππον παρελαυνειν;
Αλλ᾽ ου δηι εθελω μιμνειν ενταυθ᾽ ανοητος.
Ὡς ειπων ταφροιο διεσσυτο· γουνατα δ᾽ ίππος
Θρυλλιχθη· σκολοπες δε διετμαγεν αλλυδις αλλῃ
Αυτου ὑπο ῥιπης· παταγος δε τε γινετ᾽ ακανθων·
Του γλουτων δε μεσηγυ και ίππου φαινετ᾽ αρ᾽ ημαρ·
Αλλ᾽ ου πιπτε, πατασσε δ᾽ ενι στηθεσσι φιλον κηρ·
Αυτος δ᾽ ησπαιρεν, μαλα τι τρομεοντι εοικως.
Ὡς δ᾽ ότε τις, Λιβυων ὁρμης απο θηρητηρων,
Χωρῃ εν ἡλιβατῳ θηλυς τε τροφος τε Πιθηκος
Φευγει, φορτον εχουσ᾽, αει δ᾽ ἁμα ἑλκεται αυτῃ
Δειρῃ ενισχομενον παλαμαις τε και αγκαλιδεσσι,
Ου δεσμου δ᾽ ανισιν ατειρεος, αλλ᾽ ετι μαλλον
Αυτε ποδας σφιγγει κατα γαστερα μητρος ιουσης,
Αστεμφες τεκνον πουλυπλαγτοιο Πιθηκου·
Ὡς ίππου πλεγδην εσφιγγεν εν αυχενι χειρας
Βᾳλιος εμπεφυως· μαλα δ᾽ εσσειοντο οἱ ωμοι.
Γρυφιαδῃ δ᾽ εξαυτις ενι φρεσιν εμπεσεν οργη,
Βᾳλιον ὡς ενοησεν επειγομενον κατ᾽ αρουραν,
Η κυνας οτρυνοντ᾽· αλλ᾽ ου μεν δηρον εμελλεν
Βᾳλιος ίππευειν πρωτιστος, επει ῥ᾽ ἱμας᾽ ίππον
Γρυφιαδης αδαμαστος· ὁ δ᾽ ομμασι δη καταμυσεν·
Ου γαρ έκων ετλη λευσσειν επι ταφρον ορυκτην·

V. 232. Il. α. 59.
V. 234. Il. μ. 63.
V. 240. Il. υ. 84.
V. 245. Il. μ. 461.

Αλλ' ὡς γ' εκδιαβαντα φοβος λαβεν· εἵλετο δ' ἱππου
Χερσι λαβων χαιτην ευπηκτοις αμφοτερωθεν·
Θυνε δ' αρ' ασπαιρων ὁθ' ὑπερθορεν, ηὔτε ταυρος,
Ὃς δαμαλιν χαριεσσαν επερχεται· αυε δ' επειτα,
Αλλοτε μεν προσθ' ἱππου ἑου φιλου, αλλοτ' οπισθεν.
Αλλοι δ' ὡς δυνατον τοισδεσσ' αγεληδον ἑποντο·
Ηρχε δε Γρυφιαδης, η Βᾳλιος αλλοπροσαλλος,
Ιεμενω νικης, χθιζων μνησαντο δ' απειλων.
Ὡς τω ρ' ἱππευον γλυκερῳ θηρης εν αωτῳ,
Τερπομενω, συνεχως αϊοντε κυνων ορυμαγδον·
Αλλα μινυνθ' εχαρησαν, επει ταχεως αφικανον
Ατην αργαλεην, ἑτερην πολυ μειζονα ταφρον.
Της μεν Γρυφιαδης πρωτος θρασυς εγγυθεν ηλθεν·
Ὡς δ' ιδεν ὡς ῥιγησε, βαθος ταφροιο μεγιστον
Ομμασιν εκμετρων· ουδ' οἱ τελος ην αδηλον·
Αλλα και ὡς οἱ θυμος ενι στηθεσσιν αγερθη
Ταφρον ὑπερθορεειν, ει και μαλα δυσβατος ειη.
Τρις δ' επορυσ', ἱππου πλευραις ενι γουναθ' ερειδων·
Ὡδε δε τις ειπεσκεν ιδων ες πλησιον αλλον·
Αλλ' ὁδ' ανηρ εθελει ῥηξειν φιλον αυχενα, πιπτων
Ἠν δι' αγνωριην, τολμητης, ουδ' ελεαιρει
Πατροκασιγνητης Αλιεισης, ουδ' ερατεινων
Παρθενικων, αἱ, πολλαι, ενι φρεσιν ἱμερον ἡδυν
Λαβρῃ θαλπουσιν κεδνων αἐκητι τοκηων,
Σχετλιαι εἱνεκ' ερωτος ὀν ηλιθιως ανεφυσαν.
Τρις μεν Γρυφιαδης ανεγειρεν ὀν ἱππον ἱμασσων·
Τρις μεν ανετραπη, ἐρκος ιδων μεγα τε, στιβαρον τε·
Αλλ' ὁτε δη το τεταρτον εφορμηθεις κατα ταφρον
Εσσυτο ῥιζηδον, και αμηχανα μηδετο εργα,
Αινον τῳ κακον ηλθεν ορυκτης βενθεσι ταφρου·
Ενθεν Ὀνος μεγαλῳ κακομηχανος εβρεμεν ηχῳ·
Δεισε δ' αρ' εξαιφνης ἱππος, θρωσκων τ' αφαμαρτεν·
Ουδ' αρα Γρυφιαδῃ χραισμ' ἱπποσυνη παναριστη·
Εκ γαρ του χειρων φυγεν ἡνια· πιπτε δε γαιῃ·
Δουπησεν δε πεσων· οβολοι δ' αμφ' αυον αϋτευν
Πολλοι θυλακιῳ συμβαλλομενοι δια ῥιπην·
Ιλυς δ' ασπετος αλτο, και ὑψοθεν αμφεποτᾶτο,

V. 278. Theoc. Pharmaceut. 82. et Id. γ.
V. 289. Theoc. Id. ι. 40. V. 290. Il. ε. 436.

Αυτου πιπτοντος· μετα δ' ισχι' αγαυα πεφανται
Αμφικυλινδομενου· θαμβος δ' ἑλεν εισορωωντας·
Τον δ' ἱππος λιπεν αυτι· καρη δ' εχεν ὑψου απελθων·
Γηθοσυνῃ δ' ετιναξε πεδον, χρεμετιζε δ' ᾗ αλκῃ.
Αλλ' ου Γρυφιαδῆ λαβεν αχθος τηλυγετον ὡς·
Σκαιρων δ', ὡς βατραχος γερανου ταυμηρου αφ' ὁρμης
Αλλεται εν λειμων', αν' ελαφρως δυσετο ταφρου·
Ὡς δ' ὁτε καυθαριον, κολεοπτερυγων πετεηνων
Καλλιστον (βοεοιο πολυτρητου δια κοπρου
Ὡρῃ εν ειαρινῃ ὁτε καυθαροι εκ χθονος εἴσι)
Πειραται πτερυγων, των εστ', ετι γ', αμμορος αιθηρ,
Τον μεν πρωτον εχουσι μιασματα πολλ' ανα νωτον·
Αλλ' ου μεν, δηρον γε, μιαινεσθαι θεμις εστιν
Ωμους κυανεῳ και χρυσῳ παμφανοωντας·
Τοι γαρ ὁτ' εν ποιῃ κολεους κινησῃ, ὑπερθεν
Σαυλα μαλ' εκ νωτοιο μιασματα παντ' αποδυει,
Εκτανυει πτερυγας, πεταται πνοιῃ ζεφυροιο,
Εν φαει ηελιου παντ' ειαρος ἡδεα γευσων.
Ὡς αρα Γρυφιαδης δια βορβορον εκθορε ταφρου·
Ἑζετο δ' ορθωθεις· απομορυνυτο δ' αμφι προσωπον,
Ιλυν και κονιην και λυματα πολλ' αποδυων·
Οχθησας δ' αρα ειπε προς ὁν μεγαλητορα θυμον·
Η 'ρα κακῃ αισῃ απο πασσαλου οξεα κεντρα
Σημερον αυ ἑλομην· επει ου πως νυν τετελεσται
Ἡ μεγαλοφροσυνη τῃ ψευδων θυμον εθελγον·
Νυν δε με θηρητηρα κακον και αναλκιδα φησει
Βαλιος, ακρατον πινων μελιηδεα οινον·
Αυτου ὑπερκυδαντος αμειλικτον δ' οπ' ακουσω,
Δηρον εμου χαιροντα κατηφειῃ και ονειδει.
Ὡς εφατ' οχθησας· ανδρες δ' αροτηρες ὁν ἱππον
Χερσι μεταστρεψαντες αγον, δακνοντα χαλινον·
Του μεν Γρυφιαδης επεβη σθενεϊ βλεμεαινων,
Κερτομιοις δ' επεεσσι παραβληδην αγορευεν·
Α δειλ', ὡς μελλεις ὑπ' εμῃ δαμασασθαι ἱμασθλῃ,
Οὑνεκ' εμ' ενθαδ' επαυσας ανευθε κυνων λιγυφωνων,
Οἱ δῃ τηλοθ' ἑπονται αλωπεκι ποικιλοβουλῃ·
Αλλ' αγε, θασσον εγειρε το σον μενος, οφρα ἰδωμαι

V. 306. Il. *v.* 472.

Ει πως κεν γ' ἑταρων μετα πρωτον ὁμιλον ἱκοιμην.
Ὡς εφαθ' ἱππευων· δια δε δρυμα πυκνα και ὑλην
Θυνε μαλ' εμμεμαως· ουδ' οἱ μενος ισχεν αρουρα,
Πυροφορος περ εουσ', ου μεν ποταμοιο ῥεεθρον·
Αλλ' ἱππῳ στερεως ὁ συνηπτετο, γουνατα πλευραις
Σφιγγων, ουδ' ὑπελυσεν ἑον μενος, ισχι' ερειδων.
Ὡς δ' ὁτε τις Γαλεη ενι βησσαις, αγρι', απαστος,
Λαθρῃ, νυκτι, Λαγωον επερχεται απρονοητον,
Εξαιφνης δ' επι νωτον επεσσυται, η επι δειρην,
(Τελλει ὁτε στυγνου πρωτον σθενος Ωριωνος)
Ῥιμφα δε δειμαλεος θρωσκει φευγει τε Λαγωος,
Εγνως εχθιστην, μαλα δ' εμμεμαως αποσεισθαι
Δεσμον αναγκαιον, πικρον δ' ὑπαλυξαι ολεθρον·
Αλλ' αιει φευγοντι δυσασχετον αχθος οπηδει·
Αιει γαρ Γαλεη δειρην ολῃ καταμαρπτει,
Ηδ' ονυχων ξυνοχῃ περιείλεται, εμπεφυυῖα
Διψαλεοις χειλεσσι και ωμοφαγοισιν οδουσιν,
Ισχει δ' αστεμφες, πλειστῃ δ' ενερειδεται αλκῃ·
Ὡς αρα Γρυφιαδης ἑου εμπεδον ἑζετ' εφ' ἱππου·
Ταφρων ουδ' αλεγιζε τι, ἑρκεων ου ξυλινων τι,
Ουτ' αγροιωτων ανδρων, οἱ τηλοθεν αυτον
Χερμαδιοις εβαλον, πυρου ἑνεκ' ολλυμενοιο·
Μαλλον δ' αυ μαστιξε κατωμαδον, ηχον ακουσας·
Ἱππου δ' ὁρμηθεντος αει ῥεεν ασπετος ἱδρως·
Πολλων δ' εξ αγρων πηλος κνημιδας εβαλλεν.
Αλλ' ου Γρυφιαδης μεγαθυμος δηρον εμελλεν
Εσχατον ὁν φιλον ἱππον εχειν ελθων ενι θηρῃ·
Αιει γαρ παρελαυνεν οπιστατον ανδρα ἑκαστον,
Ἑως ὁγ' επειτα κυνων ἱερον κολοσυρτον ἱκοιτο.
Οἱ δ' αρ ισαν μεμαωτες ατειρεα συν αλαλητῳ,
Αἱματος ἱεμενοι· τους δ' αυ πολυμητις αλωπηξ
Φευγεν, και πινυτη δολον εν πραπιδεσσιν ὑφαινεν.
Αλλ' αρα φευγουσην γε τελος θανατοιο καλυψε·
Την κυνες αἱμοβοροι κρατεροισιν οδουσι λαβοντες
Εσπασαν εκθυμως, απο τ' εγκατα παντα λαφυξαν,
Ζωα και ασπαιροντα, μινυνθα περ, ουτι μαλα δην·
Δεινος γαρ χρομαδος φθιμενης ὑπερ οστε' ορωρεν,
Πολλου ὑπο γναθμοιο διαρρᾳισαι μεμαωτος.

V. 375. Il. ψ. 688.

Αυε δε Γρυφιαδης· ἱππου δ' ὀτ' απ' αλτο χαμαζε,
Ουραν αλωπεκος αυτι λαβων ενι χειρι παχειῃ
(Ου μεν γαρ μιν ετειρε δυσασχετος ὀβριμος ὁδμη)
Φασγανῳ αϊξεν, θουρους κυνας αιεν ἰμασσων·
Την δ' αρ' αποτμηθεισαν ἑλων, κατακοσμιον ειναι,
Ὑψου ανεσχεθε χειρι, και ευχομενος επος ηυδα·
Ω ποποι, η μοι θυμος ενι στηθεσσι γεγηθε·
Ειπερ γαρ παντες γ' εμ' αναλκιδα τηὸ' ενι θηρῃ
Φησουσιν, γελοωντες ενι πλειοις κυλικεσσιν,
Αλλ' ου πεισονται θαλεθουσαι πλησιοχωροι,
Κουραι Βεντιαδες, κουραι Λιγληϊδος ὑλης,
Χηδληαι Χαριτες, Δικλορνια, Κωνια, Πωϊς,
Αλλαι τ' ειαρινης ἡβης τερεν ανθος εχουσαι,
Ταων ορχηστης ῥοδοειδεα δακτυλα θελγω.
Νυν δε ποτ' οχθησει, μεγα Σαρδανιον μαλα τοιον
Γναθμοις αλλοτριοις γελοων κλεος εἱνεκ' εμειο,
Βᾳλιος· αλλ' αιει θηρῃ ενι βουλομαι αρχειν.
Ὡς φατ' επευχομενος· πιλῳ δ' ενι ουραν εθηκε·
Νευσταζεν δ' αρ' επειτα περι κροταφοισιν αγαλμα
Αυτου κινηθεντος· ὁ δ' ηϊε κυδεϊ γαιων.
Αψ δ' εβελε στρεφεμεν φιλον ἱππον· τῳ δ' ἁμ' ἑποντο
Κλαγγηδον ταχεες τε κυνες, θαλεροι τ' αιζηοι
Μελποντες κερατων ηχῳ θρασυν ορχαμον ανδρων,
Γρυφιαδεω τ' αλκην μεγαλως κλειοντες αοιδαις
ΕΣΘΛΟΥ ΘΗΡΗΤΗΡΟΣ, ΑΜΤΜΟΝΟΣ, ΊΠΠΟΔΑΜΟΙΟ.

V. 379. Hymn. in Merc. 126.
V. 384. Il. θ. 152.
V. 391. Od. ν. 299.
V. 392. Od. ν. 347.

P. BAYLEY.

DE L'IMPROVISATION POETIQUE

Chez les Anciens, et particulièrement chez les Grecs et les Romains.

PAR M. RAOUL-ROCHETTE,

DE L'INSTITUT ROYAL DE FRANCE, &c.

——— Deus, ecce Deus ; cui talia fanti
Ante fores, subito non vultus, non color unus,
Non comtæ mansêre comæ, sed pectus anhelum,
Et rabie fera corda tument, majorque videri
Nec mortâle sonans, afflata est numine quando
Jam propiore Dei. VIRGIL. ENEID. LIB. VI. 46.

Observations préliminaires.

La nation Italienne a, depuis la renaissance des Lettres, offert un spectacle qui a toujours paru unique dans l'histoire des Arts, celui de Poëtes qui, sans étude et sans préparation, produisoient à l'instant même, et sur toutes sortes de sujets, des vers harmonieux et faciles. Cette faculté merveilleuse, qui, par un privilège attaché au ciel de l'Ausonie moderne, semble être devenue le partage exclusif des habitans de cette belle contrée, étoit de nature à exciter à la fois la jalousie et l'incrédulité. Aussi la plupart des nations Européennes, après l'avoir vainement enviée à l'Italie, ont-elles cherché, mais vainement encore, à en révoquer en doute l'existence ; et leur conviction n' a pu céder qu' à des expériences, trop souvent réitérées pour ne pas fournir des preuves incontestables.

Qu'au milieu d'une assemblée nombreuse et choisie, un poëte se lève et reçoive avec le sujet sur lequel doit s'exercer sa muse, le métre qui réglera ses chants ; que, sans aucune préparation antérieure, il lui suffise d'un moment de réflexion, pour concevoir un plan, en distribuer les différentes parties, en disposer les matériaux ; qu' après avoir ainsi recueilli au-dedans de lui-même toutes les ressources de son imagination, toutes les forces de son génie, sa veine s'échappe tout-à-coup comme un torrent qui franchit sans effort les digues impuissantes qu' on lui oppose ; que, dans l'espace de quelques heures, et presque sans aucun intervalle de repos, il produise des poëmes entiers, où le sujet proposé soit traité dans toute son étendue, où les accessoires soient subordonnés à l'objet principal, où la verve se soutienne d'un bout à l'autre au même

dégré d'élévation et de chaleur, un semblable phénomène présente sans doute le dernier effort de l'esprit humain, et l'on ne peut méconnoître, à de pareils traits, le caractère d'une inspiration vraiment divine. Si j'ajoute que, dans quelques uns de ces poëmes dégagés du prestige d'une déclamation animée et rapide, et soumis au jugement du cabinet, on trouve fréquemment la justesse et la solidité des pensées, jointes à l'élégance et à la pureté du style, l'éclat et la vivacité des images, la richesse et la facilité des rimes; et qu' à peine quelques légers défauts y frappent l'œil le plus attentif et la critique la plus sévère, le sentiment de la surprise qu' on avoit éprouvé d'abord, ne se changera-t-il pas en celui de l'admiration ?

Mais une faculté si extraordinaire ne peut être le partage que d'un petit nombre de génies privilégiés, disséminés de loin en loin dans l'espace des siécles; et l'on ne sauroit disconvenir que la foule des versificateurs sans talent, qui s'en prétendoient doués, n'ait beaucoup avili le nom et la profession d'improvisateur, aux yeux même de la nation qui en faisoit un de ses plus beaux titres de gloire. La facilité de rimer, qu' offre l'idiôme le plus riche et le plus harmonieux de l'Europe, est plus favorable à la médiocrité qu' au vrai talent; et, quoique l'indignation des auteurs Italiens se soit prononcée dans les termes les plus énergiques contre ces charlatans, dont les muses grossières abusoient de la crédulité des Peuples, l'imposture usurpa souvent et usurpe encore parmi eux les honneurs qui ne sont dus qu' aux excellents et véritables improvisateurs. Mais, du moins, les Italiens instruits ne reconnoissent comme tels que ceux dont les ouvrages, soumis en naissant à des loix sévères et rigoureuses, ont subi avec succès l'épreuve lente et sûre d'un examen réfléchi, et qui ont su joindre les suffrages paisibles de leurs juges aux applaudissemens tumultueux de leurs auditeurs.

C'est en étudiant, dans le silence du cabinet, ces productions qui, nées avec la parole, ont reçu une nouvelle vie par l'écriture; c'est surtout en lisant les poëmes de GIANNI, le premier dans un art où il compte tant de rivaux, et qui ne me semble pas moins supérieur à tous ses prédécesseurs, qu'il l'est incontestablement à tous ses contemporains, que j'ai appris à connoître cette inspiration, dont le nom, appliqué à la plupart des poësies modernes, ou n'est qu'un mot vide de sens, ou ne présente qu'une idée absolument étrangère à son acception primitive. Qui pourrait en effet retrouver le caractère de l'inspiration, telle que les anciens l'ont décrite, et que leurs ouvrages nous l'offrent encore vivante, dans ces poëmes péniblement conçus et plus péniblement produits, où la verve, à chaque instant refroidie, ne brille qu' à de longs intervalles, où l'art est constamment aux prises avec la nature, et dont le principal mérite consiste à cacher la difficulté vaincue ? Qu' on se

figure un de nos poëtes, obscurément confiné dans la solitude de son cabinet, luttant avec effort contre l'expression ou la mesure, et sans cesse appelant la rime au secours de la pensée; imprimant sur chacun de ses mots les traces laborieuses de la lime, effaçant tous les traits de sa plume, à mesure qu' il les a tracés, et toujours plus mécontent de son travail, à proportion qu' il a plus de goût, détruisant souvent le lendemain l'ouvrage infortuné de la veille. A ce portrait, qu' on ne m'accusera pas d' avoir peint avec des couleurs imaginaires, opposons celui d'un des chantres de l'antiquité; entouré des flots nombreux d' un peuple qu' attirent sur ses pas le bruit de sa réputation et les sons de sa lyre, revêtu des habits de sa profession, qui impriment encore à toute sa personne un caractère plus auguste, il porte en sa main l'instrument consacré au dieu des vers, et le remplace quelquefois par la coupe chère au dieu du vin; il prélude par des accords analogues au sujet qu'il va traiter; sa verve croît et s'allume par degrés; bientôt, cédant à la force des mouvemens qui l'agitent, et au torrent des idées qui l'obsèdent, il s'élance dans une région sublime, et puise à des sources divines, ces tours hardis et pittoresques, ces images neuves et brillantes dont il embellit ses vers. Tant que l'inspiration, dont le caractère est empreint sur tous ses traits, le possède et le domine, son style est impétueux et rapide comme la pensée, vif et étincelant comme l'imagination; c'est la Pythonisse sur le trépié de Delphes, ou la Sibylle dans l'autre de Cumes.

Faut-il nous étonner, si l'opposition frappante de ces deux portraits également fidèles, a fait regarder longtemps, par des esprits préoccupés de nos mœurs et de nos habitudes modernes, le modèle du dernier comme un être fantastique, comme un personnage absolument idéal? On croit difficilement ce dont on se présume soi-même incapable; on a peine même à concevoir des faits autorisés, quand au défaut de la vraisemblance qui leur manque, se joint celui de l'expérience que nous ne possédons pas encore; et lorsque Mad. de Staël essaya de nous donner, par l'imitation, quelque idée d' un genre de poësie aussi nouveau pour nos oreilles, qu' étranger à nos connoissances, les chants improvisés de sa *Corinne* furent à peine entendus de la plupart des lecteurs Français.

Mais, à mesure que nos esprits sont devenus plus éclairés sur les effets de l'improvisation Italienne, les prodiges de la muse antique ont du nous sembler moins incroyables. Les chants de Gianni répandus dans toute l'Europe, ont, en quelque sorte, réalisé pour nous les miracles que la Grèce attribuoit à son Amphion; et lorsque le témoignage de nos oreilles s'est joint à celui de l'antiquité, pour nous donner des notions justes de la véritable inspiration, l'admiration obtenue par les poëtes modernes, nous a conduit naturellement à une étude nouvelle de la poësie ancienne.

Toutefois, nous n' avions encore, sur l'existence de l'improvisation poëtique des Grecs, que des soupçons vagues, ou tout au plus, que de faibles présomptions : on s'était contenté de conjectures, sans songer à acquérir une certitude. Pour répandre sur ce point d' histoire toute la lumière dont il étoit susceptible, il falloit recueillir des preuves et combiner des faits ; travail souvent pénible et quelquefois impraticable pour la plupart de ces hommes à qui la vérité même déplait, dès que la découverte exige de l'application et de l'étude. Il leur est, en effet, bien plus commode de croire ou de nier, selon qu'ils sont disposés à l'un ou à l'autre, sans se mettre en peine de soutenir leurs assertions, ou de justifier leur incrédulité. Ceux d'entre eux, qui ne font pas tout-à-fait dépendre leur opinion des caprices de leur goût, ont pu se croire suffisamment éclairés par le petit nombre de faits que rapporte l'auteur du *Voyage du Jeune Anacharsis*, et ils ont, avec quelqu' apparence de raison, résolu par l'affirmative la question que ce savant et ingénieux écrivain offre à la curiosité de ses lecteurs : " On peut demander, si l'usage d' improviser n' étoit pas commun à ces Grecs, doués d' une imagination aussi vive que les Italiens, et dont la langue se prêtoit encore plus à la poësie que la langue Italienne."[1] D' autres personnes, d' un jugement moins difficile, ont aisément converti en certitude ce doute qu' exprime l'abbé Barthélemy. A les entendre, l'érudition est au moins superflue, et toute discussion inutile, pour décider une question que la vraisemblance seule éclaircit suffisamment. Il seroit absurde, selon elles, de supposer que les Grecs, auxquels la nature avoit si libéralement accordé toutes les facultés poëtiques, aient été privés de celle qui exige le plus de souplesse dans la langue, de facilité dans l'esprit, de mobilité dans l'imagination, et qu' une faculté si brillante soit demeurée constamment jusqu' à nos jours le partage exclusif d' une nation qui ne possède certainement pas à un plus haut degré toutes ces qualités réunies, et qui emprunta des Grecs les premiers principes de la civilisation, et les plus parfaits modèles de la littérature.

Mais, pour établir un fait aussi extraordinaire que l'est celui de l'improvisation poëtique, il ne doit pas suffire d' alléguer de ces raisons communes, de ces généralités vulgaires qui s'appliquent à tout et qui prouvent rarement quelque chose. Les bons esprits, qui n' appuient leur conviction que sur des preuves certaines, et qui ne négligent pas les moyens de les acquérir, ne se contentent pas de si faibles probabilités. Mme. de Staël, qui ne perd jamais l'occasion de placer une pensée ingénieuse, a bien pu dire : " il y a des improvisateurs parmi les Dalmates ; les sauvages en ont aussi ; *on en trouvoit chez les anciens Grecs :* il y en a presque

[1] Voyage du jeune Anacharsis, chap. lxxx. art. Dithyrambes, note.

toujours chez les peuples qui ont de l'imagination et point de vanité sociale,"[1] cette manière vive et paradoxale de traiter les questions les plus problématiques, convient tout au plus dans un roman: quand on s'adresse à la raison des hommes éclairés, il faut employer des argumens plus solides et suivre une méthode plus rigoureuse; en un mot, c'est se jouer de soi-même et de ses lecteurs, que de décider ainsi ce qui doit être examiné.

J'ai donc cru que ce seroit un travail à la fois utile et agréable, que de rassembler dans les écrits des anciens toutes les notions propres à constater un fait, que l'on avoit jusqu'ici plutôt deviné que reconnu, et dont la croyance avoit précédé la preuve: j'ai cru que des recherches, qui devoient servir à fixer enfin l'opinion sur une question souvent agitée et jamais débattue, auroient le double avantage d'intéresser et les savans, pour qui l'instruction la plus sévère est toujours la plus agréable, et les littérateurs, qui font quelquefois grâce à l'érudition en faveur de la vérité. Dans ce siècle frivole, il est souvent moins difficile de la trouver, que de la dire. L'apparence seule du travail, dans un livre où il étoit indispensable, effarouche la plupart des lecteurs: n'estimant de l'étude, que ses résultats, ils en rejettent les moyens; toute recherche les choque, toute discussion les fatigue; leur paresse qui refuse de remonter aux sources, n'approuve même pas qu'on tâche de lui en épargner la peine: et, comme si la reconnoissance envers un écrivain auquel ils doivent leurs lumières, étoit pour eux un fardeau, ils ne consentent à jouir du fruit de ses veilles, qu'autant qu'il parviendra à leur en dérober le mérite.

Je ne me suis pas borné, dans mes recherches, à ce qui concernoit la poësie des Grecs; à mesure que j'approfondissois cette matière encore intacte, mes regards se sont étendus au delà des limites que je m'étois d'abord tracées, et le cercle de mes idées s'est aggrandi avec celui de mes connoissances. Après m'être assuré que la faculté d'improviser étoit commune chez les Grecs, j'ai voulu voir si elle leur avoit été particulière, et si les Romains, qui avoient puisé à leur école tant d'excellens principes de littérature et de leçons de goût, n'avoient point aussi emprunté de leurs modèles ou reçu de la nature le même talent appliqué aux mêmes usages. Le résultat de ces nouvelles recherches s'est trouvé presque en tout conforme à celui des premières; et, quoique, dans ce point comme en beaucoup d'autres, les Latins ne soutiennent pas avantageusement le parallèle avec les Grecs, quoique le caractère plus sévère de leur génie et de leur langue se prêtât moins aisément aux inspirations de la poësie, on en retrouve encore chez eux des traces assez nombreuses pour rendre vraisemblable,

[1] Corinne, lib. xv. c. 9, tom. iii. p. 86.

au moins sous ce rapport, la prétention qu'ont les Italiens modernes de descendre des anciens Romains.

J'aurois pu étendre les mêmes considérations à d'autres peuples de l'Antiquité, dont les productions poëtiques ont été vantées par elle, quoique le temps ne les ait pas laissé parvenir jusqu'à nous. S'il est vrai, comme l'assure un ingénieux écrivain,[1] et comme la raison seule nous autorise à le croire, que le don d'improviser ait été plus commun chez les peuples dont la civilisation étoit moins avancée, et, parconséquent, le systême de versification moins rigoureux, ces antiques poësies des Celtes et des Germains doivent avoir été le fruit d'une inspiration soudaine et fortuite, comme les événemens qu'elles retraçoient.[2] C'étoit un usage généralement établi chez les nations Celtiques, lorsqu'on partoit pour une expédition militaire, d'emmener des poëtes, qui sur les champs de bataille, ou dans les fêtes triomphales, célébroient la valeur des citoyens morts en combattant pour la patrie.[3] Ainsi, les guerriers qui succomboient, n'avoient pas longtemps à attendre la récompense d'un beau trépas; ils recueilloient, sur le théatre même de leurs exploits, le tribut de regrets et d'éloges dû à leur mémoire.[3] Les Bardes compagnons ou témoins des hauts faits qu'ils consacroient dans leurs vers, n'auroient pu, sans trahir à la fois les devoirs de leur ministère et les droits de l'amitié, offrir à l'ombre de ces héros une consolation étudiée et tardive; il falloit que leurs chants produits au même instant qu'ils en trouvoient un nouvel objet, acquittâssent promptement la reconnoissance publique dont ils étoient les organes, et ces chants improvisés par la douleur, et accueillis par elle au sortir de la bouche du poëte, se conservoient sans effort et sans altération dans le souvenir comme dans le cœur de tous ceux qui les avoient entendus.

Qui pourroit douter que l'imagination vive et prompte des peuples de l'Orient ne se soit fréquemment livrée à l'improvisation oratoire et poëtique? tout conspiroit à leur en inspirer le désir et à leur en fournir les moyens. Au bienfait d'une organisation heureuse, se joignoient ceux d'une langue abondante et sonore, d'un climat riche et varié comme elle; ils jouissoient à la fois de toutes les faveurs de la nature et de toutes les ressources de l'art. Les Arabes, dont la langue et les mœurs retracent encore celles des anciens habitans du désert, ont, dans leur idiôme actuel, un terme pour désigner *l'improvisation*, et cette expression, chez un peuple qui ne multiplie les signes de ses idées, qu'à raison du besoin qu'il en a,

---

[1] Tacit. German. §. 11; et Annal. lib. ii. c. 88. Perizon. Animadv. Histor. cap. vi. p. 211.

[2] Ammian. Marcell. lib. xv. c. 9. cf. Posidon. Historiar. lib. xxiii. apud Athen. lib. vi. c. 12; Jornandes, de rebus Getic. lib. iv. c. 5.

[3] Diodor. Sic. Bibliothec. lib. v. c. 31.

indique, ou la tradition d'un usage antique, ou l'existence d'une pratique habituelle, et probablement l'une et l'autre. Si nous connoissions davantage l'histoire littéraire du peuple Hébreu, il ne nous seroit pas difficile de retrouver aussi, dans les fragmens poëtiques qu'il nous a laissés, de nombreuses traces d'improvisation. Le savant Vossius ne voit que des *essais improvisés* dans les premières poësies des Juifs, et il regarde encore comme tels les *Psaumes*, les *Lamentations* et le dernier *Cantique de Moyse*.[1] J'adopte son opinion, sans approuver les raisons sur lesquelles elle est fondée. Le défaut de rhythme et de mètre, qui règne dans ces poëmes, aux yeux de ce critique, lui paroit suffisamment compensé par le caractère de l'inspiration. Mais des poësies, privées de rhythme et de mètre, quelque grave qu'en fût le sujet, quelque sublime qu'en fût la diction, seroient-elles de veritables poësies? On sait aujourd'hui que le défaut qui choquoit Vossius, n'existoit pas réellement dans ces poëmes sacrés, et, sans être plus éclairés sur la source de leurs beautés, nous connoissons mieux à présent le secret de leur composition. En ne considérant les œuvres des Prophètes, que sous le rapport d'une critique profane, il est également impossible de mécomoître l'inspiration par laquelle elles ont été produites, et ce jugement de l'esprit se change en un article de foi pour le philosophe Chrétien, qui révère dans ces hautes productions de la poësie les oracles mêmes de la Divinité. Les circonstances, au milieu desquelles furent prononcés les cantiques de *Débora* et de *Baruch*,[2] ceux de *Moyse* et de *Marie*,[3] le style même et la forme de ces compositions, tout nous atteste qu' elles dûrent être pareillement l'ouvrage d'une inspiration soudaine, et de pareils faits suffisent pour prouver que le talent d'improviser brilla du plus vif éclat chez le peuple Hébreu.

Les Egyptiens même, malgré leur aversion pour la poësie,[4] n'étoient pas aussi étrangers à ce talent, que des observateurs prévenus ou superficiels voudroient nous le persuader. Ils chantoient communément en l'honneur de la Déesse *Isis*, des Hymnes qui paroissent avoir été improvisés,[5] et la licence de leur fêtes religieuses n'étoit pas moins favorable à l'inspiration poëtique,

---

[1] De Natur. et Constitut. Art. Poët. c. xiii. §. 2, oper. tom. iii. p. 30.

[2] Judic. cap. v.

[3] Exod. cap. xv.; Deuteronom. cap. xxxii.; add. Joseph. Antiq. Judaic. lib. ii. c. 7. et lib. iv. cap. ultim.: Philon. vit. Mosis. le Quadrio semble partager l'opinion de Vossius (della Storia e della ragione d'ogni poësia, lib. i. distinct. ii. c. i. p. 156): "Bisogna ancor confessare, che questo genere, che noi canto all' improviso appelliamo, fu il primo genere di poësia che fosse al mondo. Non parleremo già qui de' profeti del popol di Dio: perciocchè quello Spirito che faceva lor die versi da arrestare i venti, dobbiamo credere che fosse lo Spirito del Signore, il quale gli sollevaste sopro il loro sè."

[4] Dion. Chrysostom. orat. xi. [5] Plato de Legib. lib. ii. p. 789, ed. Francf.

que les cérémonies pompeuses du culte Judaïque. On en jugera par la description suivante que fait Hérodote des fêtes de *Diane*, qui se célébroient à Bubaste, par un nombre infini de dévots et de dévotes, de tout âge et de toute condition.

" Une multitude de bateaux voguent vers cette ville, de toutes les parties de l'Egypte. Dans chaque barque, les hommes et les femmes se trouvent mêlés sans ordre et sans distinction : les hommes jouent de la flûte, et les femmes, des castagnettes : le reste de la troupe, qui ne prend point de part à ce concert, chante des vers ou frappe des mains en cadence. On s'arrête devant toutes les villes qui se rencontrent sur le passage, et la musique recommence, sur de nouveaux frais, mais toujours de la même manière. Les femmes, s'abandonnant à l'yvresse de la joie, agacent par des propos malins toutes celles qui passent à leur vue, chantent des airs libertins et exécutent des danses lascives." (Lib. 11. c. 60.)

Dans ce récit d'Hérodote, dont la naïveté atteste l'exactitude, j'ai été obligé d'adoucir la franchise de quelques expressions, de voiler la nudité de certains détails. Mais, loin de nuire à la fidélité du sens, ces légers changemens n'en ont que mieux conservé l'esprit ; et la comparaison des mœurs anciennes décrites par Hérodote avec les pratiques modernes observées par nos voyageurs, achevera d'éclaircir et de confirmer son témoignage. C'est un fait généralement reconnu, que, malgré les nombreuses vicissitudes de fortune que l'Egypte a éprouvées, et sous les diverses dominations qui l'ont successivement opprimée, les naturels de ce pays ont conservé le fond de leur caractère et un attachement inaltérable à leurs institutions nationales. Les folles cérémonies qu'autorisoit le culte d'Isis et de Diane, se renouvellent de nos jours autour des tombeaux des *Santos* et devant les églises des *Cophtes*. Le même goût pour les Pélerinages subsiste encore sur la terre des Pharaons et des Ptolémées : les mêmes danses, les mêmes instrumens de musique charment les yeux et les oreilles de ses habitans, et ces vieilles habitudes, nées du climat et enracinées sur le sol, ont constamment triomphé des entraves du koran et du sabre des Mamelouckes. Un des derniers voyageurs qui ont parcouru l'Egypte, M. Savary, nous apprend [1] qu'il se tient tous les ans au bourg moderne de *Santa*, situé sur le même canal du Nil qui conduisoit à l'antique *Bubaste*, et dans la même province, une foire où les habitans de la haute et de la basse Egypte se rassemblent en grand nombre. L'appât du gain et l'attrait du plaisir y attirent égale-

[1] Lettres sur l'Egypte, lett. xxii. tom. i. p. 234. On trouvera dans la Lettre XIV. du même voyageur des détails curieux, mais trop étendus pour être rapportés ici textuellement, sur les improvisatrices Egyptiennes nommées Almé. On peut consulter aussi sur ce sujet M. Niehburr. Description de l'Arabie, p. 93. et suiv. (trad. Franc.), et Voyage en Arabie, tom. i, p. 146. et ailleurs.

ment des multitudes de personnes de l'un et de l'autre sexe; et, si la différence des temps et du langage ne s'opposoit à cette illusion, on croiroit relire la description d'Hérodote dans celle de Savary.

Je pourrois pousser plus loin ces rapprochemens entre l'antique et la moderne Egypte. Peut-être même retrouverois-je, sans beaucoup d'efforts, parmi le peuple Hébreu, des traces de ces goûts Egyptiens, qu'un long séjour au milieu de la nation idolâtre des Pharaons avoit dû faire contracter aux compatriotes de Moyse; et les succès de la fille d'Hérodiade, si funeste à St. Jean Baptiste, nous prouveroient combien la danse mimique avoit d'empire sur le cœur des hommes et sur la volonté des princes, à une époque qui peut sembler intermédiaire entre le siècle d'Hérodote et le nôtre. Mais je n'ai ni le loisir ni les connoissances nécessaires pour suivre et développer ce parallèle. Que d'autres, plus curieux ou plus habiles que moi, portent dans ces ténèbres de l'antiquité payenne le flambeau de l'érudition orientale, et complétent ou détruisent les vues rapides que je viens d'y jeter. Je n'ai point recueilli assez de documens pour établir une discussion certaine, et, sans étendre plus loin des conjectures, qui pourroient paraître hazardées, je me bornerai à rechercher, d'abord chez les Grecs, et ensuite chez les Romains, l'origine et la nature de l'improvisation poëtique.

[*To be continued.*]

SOME OBSERVATIONS

On the Worship of Vesta, and the Holy Fire, in Ancient Rome: with an account of the Vestal Virgins.

BY G. H. NOEHDEN, LL. D.

PART II. [*Continued from No.* XXIX. *p.* 130.]

THE altar of Vesta being, as Cicero terms it, (de Legg. II. 12.) the *focus urbis*, or, according to Tacitus (Ann. XI. 23.) the *Ara Romana*, may, in this point of view, be compared to the ἑστία κοινὴ of Greece, at Delphi, mentioned by Plutarch, (Aristid. 20.) The importance attached to the holy fire, and the sanctity of the temple, where those mysterious emblems were preserved, upon which the safety of the empire, and the welfare of the people, were thought to depend, (*Delubrum Vestæ cum Penatibus Populi Romani.* Tacit. Ann. XV. 41.) accounted for that extreme degree of veneration and awe, with which those objects, and whatever was connected with them, were contemplated. Tacitus relates, that even that monster, Nero, who set every thing human and divine at nought, could not divest himself of those feelings. For having, upon a certain occasion, entered the temple of Vesta, he was seized with a sudden agitation and tremor in

all his limbs, as if the deity had struck him with terror under the consciousness of his enormities. Annal. xv. 36. *Illic* (in Capitolio) *veneratus deos, cùm Vestæ quoque templum inisset, repente cunctos per artus tremens, seu numine exterrente, seu facinorum recordatione, nunquam timore vacuus.* This is probably the same occurrence, to which Suetonius alludes. Neron. 19. *Circuitis templis, cùm in ædem Vestæ resedisset, consurgenti ei primùm lacinia obhæsit: deindè tanta oborta caligo est, ut dispicere non posset.* An instance of the pious regard in which the people held the rites of Vesta is recorded by Livy, (v. 40.) and Plutarch. (Camill. 20, 21.) in the story of Lucius Albinus. After the battle of the Allia, in which the Gauls had totally routed the Roman army, the Vestals fled from Rome with the holy fire, and their sacred images. On their flight they met a man of the lower class, (*de plebe Romanâ homo*, Liv. *ἀνὴρ δημοτικὸς*, Plutarch,) by name L. Albinus, who was carrying off his wife and little children, on a cart or waggon, together with his best and most necessary effects, in order to save them from the enemy (*τέκνα νήπια καὶ γυναῖκα μετὰ χρημάτων ἀναγκαίων ἐφ' ἁμάξης ὑπεκκομίζων*, Plut.) When he saw the sacred virgins thus destitute and distressed, and burdened with their holy trust, (—*ὡς δὲ εἶδε τὰς παρθένους ἐν τοῖς κόλποις φερούσας τὰ τῶν θεῶν ἱερὰ, θεραπείας ἐρήμους πορευομένας, καὶ κακοπαθούσας*—) he immediately took his wife, his little children, and his goods from the carriage, and gave it to the virgins, to aid and facilitate their escape. This remarkable example of piety, (*πρὸς τὸ θεῖον εὐλαβεία καὶ τιμὴ ἐν τοῖς ἐπιφαλεστάτοις καιροῖς ἐκφανὴς γενομένη*, Plut.) recalls to mind the pious Æneas of Virgil, whom the poet perhaps modelled after a similar original.

The worship of Vesta was confided to virgin priestesses, known under the name of *Vestals*, or *Vestal Virgins*. They were only two in number, when Numa first instituted them; but he subsequently added two more. Under one of the following kings, either Tarquinius Priscus, as Dionysius Halicarnassensis maintains (III. 67. ed. Reiske), or Servius Tullius, according to Plutarch, (Numa, 10.) the number was raised to six, and was afterwards never varied. *Ἓξ γενόμεναι μέχρι τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς διαμένουσι χρόνου.* Dionys. Halicarn. II. 67. A seventh Vestal is said to be mentioned on a medal, (see Nadal, Mémoires de l'Académ. des Inscriptions, T. iv. p. 167. ed. Paris, 1746. 4to.) and this number seems also to be implied in a passage of Ambrosius. (Epist. lib. II. p. 200. H. ed. Paris, 1661. *vix septem Vestales capiuntur puellæ.*) But that was certainly not the regular establishment, and the seventh, if she at any time existed, must be considered as supernumerary, or, from particular reasons and circumstances, appointed merely with an expectancy to succeed to the office. Plutarch (Numa, 10.) gives the names of the four, whom Numa selected, which were, first, *Gegania*, and *Berenia*, (or *Verenia*, *Varania*) then *Canutia*, and *Tarpeia*. These four were not found sufficient for the duties to be performed, (*διὰ τὸ πληθὸς τῶν ἱερουργιῶν*, Dionys. Hal. II. 67. ed. Reiske; compare III. 67.) and six were ultimately chosen. The appointment rested originally with the kings (*τῶν βασιλέων αὐτὰς*

αἴρουμένων, Dionys. Hal. II. 67.); in the time of the Republic with the Pontifex Maximus, and lastly it devolved, together with this dignity, upon the Emperors. The principal requisite in these priestesses was, that they must be pure virgins. The attribute of chastity seems to have been combined with the notion of purity, assigned to the holy fire, which was committed to their care, *ὡς καθαρὰν καὶ ἄφθαρτον τὴν τοῦ πυρὸς οὐσίαν ἀκηράτοις καὶ ἀμιάντοις παρατιθεμένου σώμασι. Numa entrusted the pure and uncorrupt substance of the fire, to the care of persons undefiled and unpolluted.* Plut. Num. 9. That the idea of purity was predominant with that object of worship, appears from this circumstance, that when the holy fire was, by accident, extinguished, it was not deemed proper to rekindle it from any common fire, but it must be revived from the rays of the sun. *Ὃ φασι μὴ δεῖν ἀπὸ ἑτέρου πυρὸς ἐναύεσθαι, καινὸν δὲ ποιεῖν καὶ νέον ἀνάπτοντας ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου φλόγα καθαρὰν καὶ ἀμίαντον—which, they say, must not be kindled from any other fire, but must be renewed and revived, by lighting a pure and incontaminate flame from the Sun.* Plutarch, Num. 9. The other opinion, to which Plutarch adverts, namely, that the state of virginity, by being unproductive and barren, bore an analogy to the fire, to which sterility is equally ascribed, has no rational ground to support it. Nor has the circumstance, that at Athens and at Delphi, where holy fires were also entertained, in conformity with the Grecian religion, the superintendance was committed to elderly women, who were past the time of child-bearing (*—γυναῖκες πεπαυμέναι γάμων ἔχουσι τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν.* Plutarch, Numa, 9.) any connexion with the notions that prevailed at Rome, which seem to have solely been founded on the corresponding character of purity, between Vesta and her priestesses. To this conclusion, which, I doubt not, is near the truth, that fanciful and flighty poet, Ovid, while rambling carelessly through his stories, was led, though perhaps not in consequence of much reflection, but because it presented itself as the most obvious answer to his question, *Cur sit virgineis Dea culta ministris?* For he thus solves the query, Fast. VI. 289.

Quid mirum, virgo si virgine læta ministrâ,
Admittit castas in sua sacra manus?

Cicero (de Legg. II. 12.) accounts for it by no means satisfactorily, in giving as the reason, *ut advigiletur facilius ad custodiam ignis*, implying that the Vestals, not having the attachments, affections, and cares, which belong to the married state, might the more attentively devote themselves to their sacred functions. It is such a reason as ingenious men are sometimes tempted to produce upon the spur of the moment and at random, when they have not time to consider facts, or collect data. How very unsettled Cicero's ideas were, in regard to this subject, may be inferred from what he adds, which has not the least congruity with the former, and is so vaguely and loosely expressed, that perhaps he did not rightly know himself what precisely he meant to say. His words are: ut advigiletur facilius ad custodiam ignis, *et sentiant mulieres in naturâ fœminarum omnem castitatem peti.*

Nothing, indeed, affords a more perfect type of purity, than the chastity of a virgin; and as such, it was guarded with the utmost vigilance and rigour. To ensure that chastity in the persons, who were destined for the service of Vesta, they were chosen at a very early age. They might not be older than ten years, though not younger than six. Aul. Gellius, N. A. I. 12. *Qui de Vestali virgine capiendâ scripserunt, quorum diligentissimè scripsit Labeo Antistius, minorem quàm annos sex, majorem quàm annos decem natam negaverunt capi fas esse.* Hence the common appellation of these priestesses is *Virgines Vestales;* or *Virgines Vestæ* (Liv. I. 20. Gell. N. A. I. 12.) Horace (Od. I., 2. 28.) denominates them *Virgines sanctæ:* and, in Greek, they are called *αἱ ἱεραὶ παρθένοι* (Plutarch. Num. 9. Dionys. Hal. III. 67. ed. Reiske. Appian. Bell. Civ. v. 37. ed. Schweighæuser;) or *αἱ παναγεῖς παρθένοι* (Plut. Camill. 20. Quæst. Rom. p. 154. Tom. VII. ed. Reiske.) Dio Cassius, (Lib. XLVIII. p. 554. ed. Reimar.) terms them *αἱ ἱερεῖαι αἱ ἀειπαρθένοι, sacerdotes semper virgines,* and in several places (for instance Lib. XLVIII. p. 534. lin. 26. p. 562. lin. 32.) merely *αἱ ἀειπαρθένοι, perpetuæ virgines.* Zonaras (Annal. X. 38. Tom. I. p. 410. ed. Ducange Ven. 1729.) has *αἱ ἀειπαρθένοι τῆς Ἑστίας ἱερεῖαι.* That they may be mentioned simply by the appellation *Virgines,* in Greek *παρθένοι,* (as in Dionys. Hal. II. 67.) without any adjunct or epithet, when from the context it is known who are meant, is obvious. *Sacerdos Vestalis,* (A. Gell. N. A. I. 12.) and *Sacerdos Vestæ* (Sallust. Catilin. 15.) are also appropriate denominations. They are very frequently, by Roman authors, only called *Vestales,* as by the Greek, *Ἑστιάδες,* (see Plutarch. Num. 9. Camill. 20. M. Anton. 58.)

The law required, that any one, who was to be chosen a Vestal, should be possessed of certain external advantages, in order to make both her person and character the more an object of respect. Some of these requisites are mentioned by Gellius, N. A. I. 12. One is, she must be, when chosen, *patrima et matrima,* or what the Greeks call *ἀμφιθαλής,* that is, possessed of both her parents; both father and mother must be living. An orphan, or one either fatherless or motherless, may be considered as in a sort of imperfect condition, being deprived of those supports, which naturally belong to a child. But a Vestal should, in this respect, as in all others, be perfect. Tacitus mentions, (Ann. II. 86.) that Tiberius, having to choose a Vestal, preferred, of two young females that were offered, the one whose mother had never separated from her husband, which was the case with that of the other. Such a separation rendered the state of wedlock defective, and it was not consistent with the perfection required of the condition of a Vestal, that her parents should be so circumstanced; at least it was preferable to fix upon one, who was not in such a predicament. Tiberius, therefore, acted, in this instance, with great propriety, and as a conscientious Pontifex. The words of Tacitus, (II. 86.) are: *Prælata est Pollionis filia non ob aliud, quàm quòd mater ejus in eodem conjugio manebat: nam Agrippa discidio domum imminuerat.* The other qualifications, mentioned

by Gellius, are: she must be free from defect or blemish, either in body or mind; next, she must be of ingenuous descent. The parents must neither have been in a state of servitude, nor engaged in any base and low trade, or occupation. With these provisos, the choice extended over the whole Roman people; it was made *e populo* (Gell. I. 12.) Among those, who were qualified to be chosen, but few exemptions were allowed. For example, when a sister was already a Vestal, or when the father was a *flamen, augur, quindecimvir sacris faciundis septemvir epulorum,* or *Salian* priest. The Pontifex Maximus had absolute power to take the young female upon whom the choice had fallen. The term used for the exercise of this authority is *capere sacerdotem vestalem,* or *virginem vestalem.* No other expression, as far as I recollect, is ever employed. See Gell. I. 12. Tacit. Ann. II. 86. IV. 16. XV. 22. Sueton. Aug. 31. *Pontifex Maximus capit virginem;* and as soon as he has laid his hand on her, she is, as it were, a captive to Vesta, and belongs to that deity, as if in right of property, *fit Vestæ.* (Gell. I. 12.) Since the time of Numa, a particular law had been enacted, known by the name of *Lex Papia,* which regulated the election of the vestals. The Pontifex Maximus had to select twenty young virgins from among the people; and out of these one was to be fixed upon, by lot, in the public assembly, *(in concione).* When the individual was thus appointed, the Pontifex took her *(cepit eam),* addressing her with a particular form of words, preserved by Gellius, (I. 12.) from Fabius Pictor. He uses the appellation of *Amata:* "Ita te, *Amata,* capio," because, it is said, according to Gellius, that the first who was taken, bore that name. If this be so, it must refer to a time anterior to Numa. For the names of those, which that king elected, were different, as we have seen from Plutarch. But *Amata,* though it certainly occurs as a proper name, (See Virgil. Æn. VII. 343. Ovid. Fast. IV. 879.) might yet, in this instance, have originally been applied as a term of endearment to the young servant of the goddess. When she had been *taken* by the Pontiff, she was immediately led to her new abode, the *atrium Vestæ,* a building, adjoining the temple, in which the vestals resided. In subsequent times, the proceedings, according to the Papian law, were dispensed with, in regard to the form of election; and when any man, of proper birth and character, offered his daughter for a vacant situation, she was accepted if she had the necessary qualifications. The term *capere,* however, was retained: the Pontifex Maximus still *took* her. (Gell. I. 12.) It may perhaps be thought, that the great privileges which the vestals enjoyed, as will afterwards be shown, and the dignity as well as affluence, in which they lived, might have tempted many to covet such an appointment for their daughters. But this was not the case: all the advantages which were to be expected, seem, in the opinion of the people, to have been counterbalanced by the restraints imposed upon those priestesses, and the rigor with which any transgression, on their part, was visited. Mr. Gibbon justly observes (in the History of the Decline and Fall of the Rom. Emp.

chap. xv. vol. i. p. 578. 4to ed.) that, "it was with the utmost difficulty, that ancient Rome could support the institution of six Vestals." And in note 94: "Notwithstanding the honors and rewards, which were bestowed on those virgins, it was difficult to procure a sufficient number." The right, however, existed of choosing them *ex universo populo;* but the reluctance felt to comply with the exercise of it, must have been very general. Suetonius says, (August. 31.) that in the reign of Augustus, upon such an occasion, many persons made great interest to secure their children from the lot. *Cumque in demortuæ* (Vestalis) *locum aliam capi oporteret, ambirentque multi, ne filias in sortem darent, adjuravit* (Augustus), *si cujusquam neptium competeret ætas, oblaturum se fuisse eam.* And the following passage from Tacitus, though it speaks of the voluntary offer made by some parents of their daughters, shows, by the commendation which the Emperor Tiberius bestowed upon this, as an act of patriotism, what the feelings of the people, in general, were. Annal. II. 86. *Egit gratias* (Tiberius) *Fonteio Agrippæ et Domitio Pollioni, quòd offerendo filias de officio in rempublicam certarent.* Thus likewise the donation, which, on another occasion, the same Emperor conferred on a new-elected Vestal, as an encouragement to others, may be considered as a proof, that encouragement really was necessary. Annal. IV. 16. *Utque gliscret dignatio sacerdotum, atque ipsis promtior animus foret ad capessendas cærimonias, decrevit Corneliæ virgini, quæ in locum Scantiæ capiebatur,* H. S. XX. The difficulty, indeed, of finding persons willing to give up their daughters, had, under Augustus, risen to that height, that a law was made to allow females, whose parents or ancestors had been emancipated slaves, to engage in the office. This is recorded by Dio Cassius, (Lib. LV. p. 793. lin. 35. ed. Reimar.) Ἐπειδή τε οὐ ῥᾳδίως οἱ πάνυ εὐγενεῖς τὰς θυγατέρας ἐς τὴν τῆς Ἑστίας ἱερατείαν ἐπεδίδοσαν, ἐνομοθετέθη καὶ ἐξ ἀπελευθέρων γεγεννημένας ἱεροῦσθαι—*When persons of rank were not easily prevailed on to give their daughters for the service of Vesta, it was enacted, that girls born of parents of a freed or emancipated condition, might be consecrated.* And he adds, that among this class of people the appointment became an object of ambition, and there was a considerable competition for it: καὶ ὁ μὲν κλῆρος αἰτῶν, ἐπεὶ πλείους ἠμφισβήτησαν, ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ, παρόντων πατέρων σφῶν, ἐγένετο· οὐ μέντοι τοιαύτη τις ἀπεδείχθη—*the drawing of lots, as there were several competitions, took place in the senate, in the presence of their fathers. None, however, was, upon this occasion, actually appointed.*"

In the *atrium Vestæ* they were maintained at the public expense, δίαιταν ἔχουσαι παρὰ τῇ θεῷ, as Dionysius Halic. expresses it, (II. 67. ed. Reiske.) This was established by Numa, according to Livy, (I. 20.) *Virginesque Vestæ legit,* (Numa)—*his, ut assiduæ templi antistites essent, stipendium de publico statuit.* Their revenue seems to have been ample, and under the Emperors even splendid; for they frequently experienced the liberality of these princes. Augustus raised their income, as Suetonius observes, (Aug. 31.) *Sacerdotum commoda auxit, præcipuè Vestalium Virginum.*

The religious duties of the Vestals related, *first* and principally, to the care of the holy fire. The welfare of the state was thought to depend upon it, that this was kept burning without intermission. The greatest alarm was felt, if, by any chance, it was extinguished. (Liv. XXVIII. 11.) *Plus omnibus aut nuntiatis peregrè, aut visis domi prodigiis terruit animos hominum ignis in æde Vestæ extinctus.* And Dionys. Hal. II. 67. ed. Reiske, says: ἡ σβέσις τοῦ πυρὸς, ἣν ὑπὲρ ἅπαντα τὰ δεινὰ, ῥωμαῖοι δεδοίκασιν, ἀφανισμοῦ τῆς πόλεως σημεῖον ὑπολαμβάνοντες, ἀφ' ἧς ποτ' ἂν αἰτίας γένηται· καὶ πολλαῖς αὐτὸ θεραπείαις ἐξιλασκόμενοι κατάγουσι πάλιν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν—*beyond every thing that is alarming, the Romans dread the extinction of the holy fire, considering it as a sign of the impending destruction of the city, to whatever cause it may be owing; and they restore it in the temple with many acts of devotion.* The latter part is also confirmed in the passage of Livy just quoted: *Id quanquam, nihil portendentibus Deis, ceterum negligentiâ humanâ acciderat, tamen et hostiis majoribus procurari, et supplicationem ad Vestæ haberi placuit.* In a former page it was shown, from Plutarch, (Numa, 9.) how the holy fire, when extinguished, was to be rekindled, namely, by means of a burning mirror. But since writing that passage, I have seen in Festus, (Lib. X. under the word *Ignis,*) another mode, which, that author says, was practised at Rome, and consisted in twirling a stick in a piece, or board, of some particular wood, till it caught fire. This fire the Vestal then took up in a brazen sieve, and carried it into the temple: *mos erat tabulam felicis materiæ tam diu terebrare, quousque exceptum ignem cribro æneo virgo in ædem ferret.* This is the well known method of obtaining fire, employed by the Indians. *Terebrare* is here, to turn by quick rotation, to twist; and *felix materia,* is wood fit for that holy purpose, to which some particular kinds were most likely appropriated; it may be called, consecrated wood. The process, thus described by Festus, is quite different from the operation of the mirror detailed by Plutarch; and unless we are to suppose, that both expedients were equally resorted to, I have to acknowledge that I have been mistaken in applying the passage of Plutarch to the Romans, when he meant to have it referred to the Greeks, of whom he had likewise spoken. But it will be seen, upon looking at that passage, that, by the rules of interpretation, I was justified in making the application I did: for the Romans were certainly the last subject that preceded. I have as yet not been able to bring this doubt to a determination, by the authority of any other ancient writer. In order to maintain the holy fire, it appears that regular watches, or periods of attendance were allotted to the several Vestals. Hence is the term *custodire ignem,* as in Cicero de Legibus, II. 8. *Virgines Vestales in urbe custodiunto ignem foci publici sempiternum.* The Greek expression is, φυλάττειν τὸ ἄφθιτον πῦρ. (Plutarch Tiber. Gracch. c. 15.) The watch was called *custodia,* as in Livy, (XXVIII. 11.) *Vestalis, cujus custodia noctis ejus fuerat.* And she that had the watch, is designated by the appellation of *custos,* as in Valerius Maximus, (I. 1, 6.) *P. Licinio Pontifici Maximo Virgo Vestalis, quia quadam nocte parum diligens*

æterni ignis custos fuisset, digna visa est quæ, &c. This watching applied particularly to the night: thence Ovid (Fast. VI. 267.) seems to have taken the epithet *vigil ignis*. It was in the night that the strictest attention was required, when sleep might overpower the guardian, and the spark might be extinguished. The *other* functions of the Vestals consisted in performing sacrifices, (*sacra facere*, Plin. Ep. IV. 11.) and other solemn rites: θυηπολοῦσαί τε καὶ ἄλλα θρησκεύουσαι κατὰ νόμον. (Dionys. Hal. II. 67. ed. Reiske.) Even in the night, there were sometimes sacrifices to be performed, as may be inferred from a passage in Seneca, (de Providentiâ, c. V.): *Nobilissimas Virgines ad sacra facienda noctibus excitari.* But their duties were multifarious, there was no solemnity of any importance, at which their presence was not required or desired. Thus they were present in the house of Cicero, when consul, at a sacrifice offered up by him, at the time of Catiline's conspiracy, (see Dio Cass. Lib. XXXVII. p. 134. ed. Reimar.): and at the rites of *Bona Dea*, celebrated in Cæsar's house, when he was prætor, (ibid. p. 139.). This was the occasion, when P. Clodius introduced himself in disguise, as the lover of Pompeia, the wife of Cæsar. They assisted at every great ceremony, especially when it was connected with religious acts. For instance, they consecrated the ground, where a temple was to be erected, as is seen from a passage in Tacitus, (Hist. IV. 53.) *dein Virgines Vestales, cum pueris puellisque patrimis matrimisque, aquâ, vivis e fontibus omnibusque haustâ, perluere*—"then the Vestal Virgins, attended by a chorus of boys and girls, sprinkled the ground with water, drawn from living fountains and rivers." A chorus of children, (boys and girls,) was usually employed upon solemn religious occasions, as we know from Horace, Od. III. 1. 4. Carm. Sæc. 6.; and from Catull. Hym. XXXIV. 3. 4. They were children of the first families: *Virginum primæ, puerique claris patribus orti.* Hor. Od. IV. 6. 31. They were very young; hence *teneræ virgines*, Hor. Od. I. 21. 1. And for this reason, the epithets *casti* (Hor. Carm. Sæc. 6.), and *integri*, (Catull. Hymn. XXXIV. 3. 4.) belonged to them. The latter may denote their innocence, or perhaps be referred to the circumstance of the children's being *patrimi et matrimi*, that is, not orphans, but in possession of both their parents. This was considered as the perfect condition of a child, and required in such as were admitted to the performance of religious functions. It was insisted on, as has been observed above, in the election of a young Vestal. Since, therefore, not indiscriminately, any children were permitted to officiate, but only such as had particular qualifications, the poet, (Carm. Sæc. 6.) very justly denominates these *lecti*. Upon some emergencies, the prayers of the Vestals were desired, as being supposed to have a peculiar efficacy. For example, it was thought that they could, by their prayers, hinder the escape of runaway slaves. Plin. H. N. XXVIII. 3. ed. Bip. *Vestales nostras credimus nondum egressa Urbe mancipia retinere in loco precatione.*

These duties were to be learnt with great attention and precision; and the first ten years of a Vestal were regarded as her apprenticeship. The space of their holy servitude was altogether of thirty

years, which, according to Dionys. Halic. and Plutarch, was thus divided: the first ten years, to learn the duties; the second ten, to officiate; the last ten, to teach others. Dionys. Hal. II. 67. ed. Reiske: *χρόνον τριακονταετῆ μένειν αὐτὰς ἀναγκαῖον—ἐν ᾧ δέκα μὲν ἔτη μανθάνειν αὐτὰς ἔδει· δέκα δὲ τελεῖν τὰ ἱερά· τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ἔτη, διδάσκειν ἑτέρας—they are compelled to remain for the period of thirty years, in which they must learn ten years, ten years officiate, and the remaining years instruct others.* Plutarch's words are these, (Numa, 10.) *ὡρίσθη δὲ ταῖς ἱεραῖς παρθένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως ἀγνεία τριακονταέτις, ἐν ᾗ τὴν μὲν πρώτην δεκαετίαν, ἃ χρὴ δρᾶν μανθάνουσι· τὴν δὲ μέσην, ἃ μεμαθήκασι δρῶσι· τὴν δὲ τρίτην, ἑτέρας αὐταὶ διδάσκουσι.—the time for which they were consecrated to the holy service, was fixed by Numa at thirty years,* of which the first ten were *employed in learning what they had to do; the next ten in practising what they had learnt, and the last ten in instructing others.* A newly elected Vestal, who was yet learning (*παρθένος τῶν νεωστὶ κατειλεγμένων καὶ ἄρτι μανθανούσων.* Dionys. Hal. II. 68.) it seems, was called *discipula,* as we may infer from Valer. Max. I. 1. 7. *Maximæ verò Virginis Vestalis* discipulam, *extincto igne, tutam ab omni reprehensione Vestæ numen præstitit.*

At the expiration of those thirty years, they were released from their vows. It was then at their option to quit their sacred station, and pursue another mode of life. They might even marry, if they chose. Plutarch, Numa 10. *εἶτ' ἀνεῖται τῇ βουλομένῃ μετὰ τὸν χρόνον τοῦτον ἤδη καὶ γάμου μεταλαμβάνειν, καὶ πρὸς ἕτερον τραπέσθαι βίον, ἀπαλλαγείσῃ τῆς ἱερουργίας—then it is permitted, after this time, to any one so inclined, to enter into the married state, and follow a different mode of life, having divested herself of the sacerdotal character.*" It was, however, not implied, that after the destined period of their service had expired, they must necessarily retire from it: on the contrary, as Plutarch observes, there are but few recorded who availed themselves of that privilege; and those who did, he says, passed the remainder of their lives in regret and sorrow, without prosperity and joy, repining at the step they had taken. *Λέγονται δ' οὐ πολλαὶ ταύτην ἀσπάσασθαι τὴν ἄδειαν, οὐδ' ἀσπασαμέναις χρηστὰ πράγματα συντοχεῖν, ἀλλὰ μετανοίᾳ καὶ κατηφείᾳ συνοῦσαι τὸν λοιπὸν βίον, ἐμβαλεῖν τὰς ἄλλας εἰς δεισιδαιμονίαν, ὥστε μέχρι γήρως καὶ θανάτου διατελεῖν ἐγκαρτερούσας καὶ παρθενευομένας.—Not many are said to have embraced this permission, nor, when they did, were they cheered with prosperity, but, passing their lives in dejection and regret, served as a warning to others to persevere in their duty to the very limit of decrepitude and death.* (Plutarch. Num. 10.)—Dionysius Halic. (II. 67. ed. Reiske), coincides in this remark: *καὶ ἐποίησαν τοῦτο* (namely, *γαμεῖσθαι*) *πάνυ ὀλίγαι, αἷς ἄηθλοι συνέβησαν αἱ τελευταὶ τῶν βίων, καὶ οὐ πάνυ εὐτυχεῖς· ὥστε δ' οἰωνοῦ λαμβάνουσαι τὰς ἐκείνων συμφορὰς αἱ λοιπαί, παρθένοι μένουσι παρὰ τῇ θεᾷ μέχρι θανάτου.* Tacitus mentions one, who had discharged her sacred functions for fifty-seven years. Annal. II. 86.: *quæ septem et quinquaginta per annos summâ sanctimoniâ Vestalibus sacris præsederat.* And in an inscription quoted by

Gronovius, in a note to Tacitus, (Annal. III. 64.) one is recorded, who had been a Vestal 64 years. As they entered the priesthood very young, at an age not exceeding ten years, it is natural to suppose, that, even after the thirty years of service, that is, at the age of forty or less, the inclination to the married state, and the pleasures of social freedom, from which they had been debarred, might not be subdued. But to the gratification of such a propensity was opposed the loss of many great advantages, for the enjoyment of which long habit must have given them a taste and relish. They would, in particular, ill bear the privation of that respect and honour, to which they had been accustomed, and not endure to see them succeeded by neglect and contempt from the public. For a Vestal, that had quitted her sacred station from worldly motives, was not likely to meet with much regard from a superstitious or prejudiced people.

In speaking of the privileges and distinctions, appertaining to the Vestals, we may begin with the words of Dionysius Hal. (II. 67. ed. Reiske): Τιμαὶ δὲ αὐταῖς παραδέδονται παρὰ τῆς πόλεως πολλαὶ καὶ καλαί—*great and noble are the honours which are bestowed upon them by the state.* From the moment one was chosen, though only a child, she was put in full possession of all her civil rights; the *patria potestas* over her ceased: she could make her will (*habebat jus testandi,* seu *testamenti faciundi,*) and perform other acts of law, which were competent to a free citizen. See Gellius (I. 12.), and Plutarch (Numa, c. 10.) It is necessary to transcribe the passage from the latter author, in order to correct an inaccuracy, of which he seems to be guilty. He is speaking of Numa instituting the order of the Vestals, and proceeds thus: τιμὰς δὲ μεγάλας ἀπέδωκεν αὐταῖς, ὧν ἐστι καὶ τὸ διαθέσθαι ζῶντος ἐξεῖναι πατρὸς, καὶ τ' ἄλλα πράττειν ἄνευ προστάτου διαγούσας, ὥσπερ αἱ τρίπαιδες;—*he* (Numa) *conferred upon them great honours, of which one is to have the power of making their will, in the life-time of their father, and to perform other acts, being without a curator, as married women with three children.* If Plutarch means to say, that Numa gave them what is called, in the Roman law, *jus trium liberorum,* it is a great oversight: for every one who is acquainted with that law, knows that this prerogative did not exist in those early days, but had its origin in the time of Augustus, being founded on the *Lex Julia de maritandis ordinibus,* enacted in the year of Rome, 736, and the *lex Papia Poppæa,* de *præmiis liberos habentium,* of the year 761. The *jus trium liberorum* conferred some important legal advantages, for instance, that of succeeding to an inheritance without a will and testament, as heir at law: and that of receiving a legacy bequeathed; of which privileges the childless were deprived. That right, or *jus,* was bestowed upon the Vestals, not by Numa, but by Augustus, as Dio Cassius expressly mentions (Lib. LVI. p. 814. lin. 100. ed. Reimar.) καὶ ταῖς ἀειπαρθένοις πάντ', ὅσαπερ αἱ τεκοῦσαι εἶχον, ἐχαρίσατο—*he bestowed upon the Vestal Virgins all the privileges, which the mothers of families enjoyed.* This act of Augustus is referred to the year of Rome, 762.

I will now enumerate some of the honors, by which the Vestals were distinguished. They were preceded by lictors, when they went out, like the first dignities in the state—*ῥαβδουχοῦνται προϊοῦσαι.* (Plutarch, Num. 10.) This mark of distinction was not of early date, but from the time of the triumvirate of Octavius, M. Antony, and Lepidus, the year of Rome 712. This we learn from Dio Cassius, who likewise informs us of the circumstances, to which that privilege was owing. It happened that one of the Vestals coming home one evening, was insulted by some libertines who did not know who she was; and, to prevent any similar occurrence, the Triumvirs decreed, that each Vestal should have *one* lictor for her protection when she went out. The original motive of this attendance, therefore, was security. The passage in Dio Cassius is Lib. XLVII. p. 504. lin. 54. ed. Reimar. *ταῖς δὲ ἀειπαρθένοις ῥαβδούχῳ ἑνὶ ἑκάστῃ χρῆσθαι· ὅτι τις αὐτῶν ἀπὸ δείπνου πρὸς ἑσπέραν οἴκαδε ἐπανιοῦσα ἠγνοήθη τε καὶ ὑβρίσθη—they* (the Triumvirs,) *allowed the Vestals to have each a lictor; because one of them coming home in the evening from a banquet had been mistaken and insulted.* When they met any of the magistrates and high dignities, these were obliged to go out of the way for them, and order their lictors to drop the fasces in token of respect. Seneca, Excerpt. Controvers. VI. 8. *Magistratus suos fasces submittunt: consules prætoresque viâ cedunt.* If a Vestal happened to meet a criminal on his way to execution, he was immediately set at liberty, and exempted from the intended punishment. The Vestal, however, was obliged to declare on her oath, that this meeting was accidental, and not purposely contrived. (Plutarch, Num. 10.) If any one had the presumption to pass under a litter, in which a Vestal was carrying, he was punished with death, (ibid.) Even the power of the tribunes of the people, that uncontrollable authority, seems to have bowed respectfully before the Vestals. Suetonius, (Tib. 2.) relates, that a Vestal, who was of the Claudian family, was enabled by the respect which her sacred character commanded, to ensure the honour of a triumph to her brother, in opposition to the will of the people: for the tribunes did not venture to use their *veto*, or stop the procession. *Etiam Virgo Vestalis fratrem in jussu populi triumphantem, ascenso simul curru, usque ad Capitolium prosecuta est, ne vetare aut intercedere fas cuiquam tribunorum esset.* This circumstance is also mentioned by Cicero, pro Cœlio, c. 14. and by Valer. Max. IV. 6. who both agree in saying that it was her father, and not her brother, whom the Vestal Claudia thus protected. From the veneration in which the Vestals were held, their intercession always had great weight; and was, therefore, often sought by those who were in difficulty and danger. Their good offices, for example, were employed to save Cæsar from the displeasure of Sulla. (Sueton. Jul. 1.) *donec per Virgines Vestales, perque Mamercum Æmilium, et Aurelium Cottam, propinquos et affines suos, veniam impetravit.* Thus Tiberius paid great regard to the petition of the Vestal Torquata, in behalf of her brother Silurus. Tacit. Annal. III. 69. And the entreaties of Vibidia, addressed to Claudius in favor of the wretched

Messalina, though eluded by Narcissus the Emperor's favorite, could with difficulty be resisted. Tacit. Annal. XI. 34. Vitellius, finding himself hard pressed by his opponents, and almost reduced to extremities, sent the Vestals with letters to one of the generals of Vespasian. Tacit. Hist. III. 81. *Obviæ fuere et Virgines Vestales cum epistolis Vitellii ad Antonium scriptis.—Virgines cum honore dimissæ.* The same is mentioned by Dio Cassius (Lib. LXV. p. 1073. ed. Reimar.) πρεσβεῖς μετὰ τῶν ἀειπαρθένων ἔπεμψε.—To do honor to the victorious Octavian, the senate directed that a solemn procession, with the Vestals at the head, should go out to meet him on his return to Rome. This was in the year 724. U. C. Dio Cass. Lib. LI. p. 649. ed. Reimar. καὶ ἐς τὴν πόλιν εἰσίοντι αὐτῷ τάς τε ἱερείας τὰς ἀειπαρθένους, καὶ τὴν βουλὴν τόν τε δῆμον μετά τε τῶν γυναικῶν καὶ μετὰ τῶν τέκνων ἀπαντῆσαι ἔγνωσαν.—In the theatre, and at every public exhibition, the Vestals had the most honorable place assigned them. Sueton. Aug. 44. *Virginibus Vestalibus locum in theatro separatim et contra prætoris tribunal dedit.* And Tiberius ordered, that his mother, Livia, to whom he always paid the most marked respect, should, when she went to the theatre, be seated where the Vestals were. Tacit. Ann. IV. 16.: *quotiens Augusta theatrum introisset, ut sedes inter Vestalium consideret.* The following may also serve as a proof of the extreme veneration in which they were held. Dio Cassius relates that Caligula wishing to testify that high regard which he entertained for his aunt Antonia, conferred upon her the distinctions peculiar to the Vestals; and in the same manner he honoured his sisters. Lib. LIX. p. 904. ed. Reimar. τήν τε τήθην τὴν Ἀντωνίαν πλεῖστα ὅσα εὐσεβῶς ποιήσας—ταύτην γὰρ Αὐγούστειν τε εὐθὺς καὶ ἱερείαν τοῦ Αὐγούστου ἀποδείξας, πάντα αὐτῇ καθάπαξ ὅσα ταῖς ἀειπαρθένοις ὑπάρχει ἔδωκε, καὶ ταῖς ἀδελφαῖς ταὐτά τε τὰ τῶν ἀειπαρθένων. Hence it appears that a Vestal was an important personage, and it will not surprise us that Tacitus mentions the death of such an individual among the remarkable occurrences of the year. (Annal. XV. 22.) *Defunctaque Virgo Vestalis Lælia, in cujus locum Cornelia, e familiâ Cossorum, capta est.* In short, nothing could surpass the respect which the Roman people showed them. Plutarch, therefore, justly asks the question (in Ti. Gracch. 15.): τί δ' οὕτως ἅγιον ἐν Ῥώμῃ καὶ σεμνὸν ὡς αἱ περιέπουσαι παρθένοι καὶ φυλάττουσαι τὸ ἄφθιτον πῦρ; *what is there so sacred and so venerable in Rome, as the virgins that tend and guard the imperishable fire?* And Seneca, in the same spirit, addresses a similar query to one of the Vestals. (Excerpt. Controv. VI. 8.) *Numquid exiguâ mercede virgo es?* "are the compensations, which you receive for the duties of your situation, trifling?"

THE SHIPWRECK OF ST. PAUL;
A SEATONIAN PRIZE POEM.

UNLOOSE the helm, the lofty mast-head scale,
And bid the swelling canvas catch the gale.
Guide me, ye gentle Zephyrs, safely round
The wide Atlantic's European bound—
Guide me where check'd the sullen billow waits,
And rampir'd Calpe guards the frowning straits.
Safe through the pillar'd portal let me glide,
And gain the bosom of that classic tide,
Which ardent here to sultry Afric roars,
There milder breaks on Europe's southern shores;
Which onward sleeps embay'd on Asia's sands—
Eventful centre of immortal lands—
Gladly I ride, where heroes plough'd the deep;
Shout, where they triumph'd; where they perish'd, weep.
Hail, distant isles, with blue-topp'd mountains grac'd!
Hail, first-born tenants of the watery waste!
Nor thou the least in honor mid the throng,
Whate'er thy name, shalt grace my humble song,
Daughter of arms, fair Malta! fam'd afar
For matchless enterprize and deeds of war.
What though unkindly Nature never smiles
On thy stern face, as on thy sister isles;
Or, haply, envious at thy might foreknown,
Thy future fates and fame above her own,
Sick at the sight in joyless moment plann'd
Thy rocky desert, and thy shapeless sand;
Yet round thy rock the Muse her wreath shall twine,
And wed thy hallow'd name to themes divine.
For thee shall bid roll back th' historic page,
And track thy titled praise from age to age.
Still o'er thy towers, in mystic pomp on high,
Sits, eagle-wing'd, thy guardian, Victory:
Still thy red banners, waving to the skies,
Responsive tell thy high-born destinies.
'Twas thine with Europe's choicest sons to shine,
And call her brightest flower of knighthood thine.
Illustrious band! who erst were doom'd to bleed,
On Jordan's banks, for Judah's captive seed:
Of pilgrim-saints, who watch'd the nightly rounds,
Chas'd their rude foes, and staunch'd their streaming wounds.
And later yet, when Mecca's countless hosts
Urg'd ruthless war, and shook the bigot's[1] coasts;
When the fierce Turk drove on his madding crew,
And the proud crescent o'er St. Elmo flew;

[1] Philip II. of Spain.

Thy barrier rock still bared its dauntless breast,
And bade th' affrighted chiefs of Europe rest.
Nor then alone thy sons the cross rever'd,
Or glad hosannas through thy shores were heard.
Roll back, ye years! and show, from eldest time,
The sainted honors of that favor'd clime.
Yes! on that clime arose with earliest ray
The bright effulgence of the Christian day;
Her's was the lot mid first-born saints to shine,
And with th' angelic host her song combine;
From God's own hand to catch the heavenly bread,
Drink living waters from the fountain-head;
Before the infant cross in faith to fall,
And view the SAVIOUR in the godlike PAUL.
Dark was the night, and loud the tempest's roar,
And rude the wave which laid him on the shore.
See, mid the fragments on the wreck-worn strand,
The Hero-Saint, the great Apostle stand!
His heaving breast the foamy showers yet beat,
And streaming garments flow around his feet;
Down his stern cheek the Ocean-drops descend,
And tears of joy a mingling tribute lend;
Whilst notes of praise, by fav'ring whirlwinds driven,
Mount in the blast, and wing their way to heaven.
Wildly around his rude companions press:
Part kneel, and crowd, the Prophet-Saint to bless;
Part, struggling, yet scarce scale the shelving bank:
Part heave the wreck; part clasp the floating plank.
Hail, mighty Master of the Gentile race!
Hail, chosen vessel of immortal grace!
Thou, on whose path a more than mid-day blaze
Proclaim'd thee destin'd to thy Maker's praise!
Yet faint that emblem, faint that mystic sign
Of glowing ardors, and a zeal like thine.
Thine were the gifts of more than Nature's birth—
Celestial treasures lodg'd in mortal earth:
Thine was the look to Heaven's own fire allied,
Whose with'ring glance could blast the brow of Pride:
'Twas thine Persuasion's varying powers to prove;
This which commands, and that which melts to love:
For thee each earth-born passion dropp'd its name;
Pain was thy pleasure, and reproach thy fame;
Thy safety, suff'ring mid severest foes;
Despair thy hope, and danger thy repose.
But say, doth He, the Just One, thus reward?
Do they, his Saints, for this obey their Lord?
Say, when the madd'ning tempest roar'd amain,
And meeting tides engulph'd the helpless train,

Had He forgotten to be gracious? He,
Who for his Son erst bid the subject sea
Stay its proud waves, in solid union meet,
And yield a pavement to its Maker's feet?
Did He now sleep, all heedless of his care;
Or blindly rage, nor e'en his Prophet spare?—
Dark is the mystic veil that shades thy laws:
Help me, thou great Eternal! help thy cause!
Help me, as back I trace the tangled line,
And mark in each event the bright design!

On those far shores, long bleach'd with southern suns,
Once Cretan nam'd,—so ancient story runs—
Lasea, eldest glory of the isle,
Long time had rear'd her venerable pile.
A friendly port here spread its shelter'd bays,
"Fair" in its name, and fairest in its praise;
Though Memory now in vain would track the cove,
Or o'er Lasea's long-lost glories rove;
Yet thither oft, by toils and dangers spent,
His tardy course the hapless seaman bent;
There, safe embosom'd in the circling steep,
Glad view'd the storm, and heard the roaring deep.
So fared the bark, whose lofty sides detain'd
The Tarsian Saint, with Cesar's captives chain'd:
In haste they sought Italian shores afar,
Condemn'd to stand at Rome's Imperial bar.
Yet vain their haste;—with disappointed eyes
Th' impatient master saw the billows rise;
Heard the deep roar, and mark'd his quivering masts
Wide-lash'd with foam, and fierce autumnal blasts:
Foil'd all his art, he sought the friendly bay,
To catch with eager hope a brighter day.

Still on the deck th' undaunted sailors range,
And watch each presage of approaching change;
Their impious pray'rs invok'd each threat'ning cloud,
And to their idol gods new service vow'd.

Presumptuous vows! what soon shall these avail,
To quench the horrors of the rising gale?
Soon other pray'rs the faithless crew shall wake,
Taught by another power their pride forsake;
Soon shall they own Jehovah's slighted care,
And know his gift, and prize the Saint they bear.

He o'er the rest, illustrious Captive! towers,
And in discourse divine high wisdom pours;
True to his charge, the Saviour's power displays,
Whose voice the wind and rebel sea obeys.
When lo! his temples new refulgence shed,
And sudden glories gild his sacred head;

Deep fixt in silent converse with the sky,
Celestial visions light his glist'ning eye;
Labors his thought intent on high presage,
Opes the dark book, and reads the mystic page;
The God descending fills his raptur'd soul,
And tides of future fate around him roll.
" Moor, moor the fatal vessel," then he cried,
" Ride out the tempest, here in safety ride.
" Warns you late Tisri's hallow'd season past,
" Warns you keen winter's wide-devouring blast:
" And He more dread, whose hand creation holds,
" And all the future's darkest stores unfolds,
" Late o'er my head in mystic vision sate,
" And warn'd the dangers of approaching fate.
" E'en now my ravish'd eye the omen fills—
" Too certain omen of impending ills—
" The pendent scale, half lost in circling gloom,
" Ascending tells th' inevitable doom.
" Far, far around, on desolating wings,
" Death's darkling angel fearful influence flings;
" Whilst wails and shrieks of woe and wild despair
" Or rend, or seem to rend, th' astonish'd air.
" Moor, moor the vessel," then again he cried,
" Ride out the winter, here in safety ride."
Vain was the warning; vain the thunders hung
Fierce on his brow, and echoed from his tongue.
Scarce had he spoke, when now the angry storm
Shrouds in deceitful calm his awful form;
The watery clouds returning sun-beams streak,
And the hush'd waves scarce murmur as they break.
Th' exulting seamen hail the kindly gleam,
And mock the boding Prophet's coward dream.
Fain would the Muse meantime the Saint pourtray,
Speak as he spoke, and all his power display.
Sternly his keen regards their rashness chide,
Insensate confidence, and guilty pride;
Sternly his voice proclaims the vengeful hour,
And all his presence beams celestial power.
They, still obdurate, mock the heavenly sounds;
No mercies melt them, and no threat confounds.
The anchor rose; th' expanding sail resign'd
In haste its folds, and gather'd all the wind.
Vig'rous with hope, the stubborn helmsman plies
His destin'd path, nor dreams of alter'd skies.
The winding shores direct their dubious track,
And, as they pass, still seem to hasten back.
Alternate cliff, and sand, and tufted bay,
And creek, and town-clad valley, glide away.

Soft round the stern the southern breezes sport,
And bid them hope Phenice's shelter'd port.
So pass they proudly on, nor heed the prayer
Which fervent now the mildly-breathing air
Wafts from the lips of Paul, where firm he stands;
Whilst eyes enraptur'd and uplifted hands
Proclaim the high employ: humbly he bows;
Humbly invokes the Saviour to his vows.
" All-gracious Power! whose equal mercy moves
" The wretch who spurns thee, and the saint who loves;
" Who e'en canst deign to deadliest foes thy grace,
" And with thy light each dark corruption chase:
" All-gracious Power! be mighty still to save;
" Be prompt to give, though man be slow to crave;
" Restrain the wand'ring, bend the stubborn will,
" And still rebellious guide thy creatures still;
" Guide the frail bark along its dangerous way,
" Avert the storm, or grant the shipwreck'd day!"
'Twas thus in meek address the Prophet bow'd;
In pity thus, yet mix'd with anger, glow'd.
Now where aloft the swelling sail display'd
Athwart the deck its broad and steady shade,
He stood and mus'd, from all the throng apart,
The prescient horror thrilling at his heart.
Conscious he views the waves in stillness sleep,
As ambush'd legions treach'rous silence keep;
Conscious surveys the impious crew elate
With other joys than suit their pending fate.
Close wrapp'd in meditative mood he stands;
Thought follows thought, and all his soul expands.
Then mingling to his mental sight arise
Life, death, and all their dark varieties;
Ideas vast, unutter'd, undefin'd,
Crowd each on each, and throng his laboring mind:
Mysteries of heaven and earth, obscure to scan,
The ways of God, and destinies of man.
But soon, all ripe for birth, th' approaching doom
Recals the Prophet's towering spirit home:
Still as he marks unseen the lifted rod,
Still as he bows submissive to his God—
Hark! through th' affrighted crew the sign is given—
A sudden darkness veils the eye of heaven.
Deep gusts proclaim th' encounter in mid air,
And mutt'ring thunder bids the world prepare.
The black'ning clouds in dizzy poise whirl round,
And heaving Ocean trembles to the ground.
The airy tenants skim their backward flight,
And scream, and fly the tempest-brooding night.

The vessel groans; her sides all powerless rock
In doubtful poise, and wait the destin'd shock.
Bursting at length, and wrought to general rage,
Th' unfetter'd winds one desperate conflict wage.
From side to side the eddying currents driven,
Now shift, and sweep by turns the face of heaven;
Now vanquish'd join in one their dubious course
And pour in loud Euroclydon their force.
He all resistless roars along the main,
And rolls the tide of mightiest hurricane.
With deaf'ning sound the congregated blast
Wide sweeps the deck, and clamours round the mast.
The levell'd billows bend beneath its power;
Then clashing, scatter far a foamy shower;
Aspiring then in briny mountains rise,
And Ocean mingles with descending skies.
The teeming clouds in one wide deluge break,
Whilst pealing thunders all their fury wake.
Now, mid the growing tempest's ceaseless yell,
Aghast the pilot marks the whitening swell;
And starts to view the lightning's forked path,
Lest his tall mast should tempt the arrowy wrath.
O! for some shelt'ring creek, some friendly land!
Phenice's port! Lasea's slighted strand!
In vain! far, far aloof his course is borne,
His rudder useless, and his canvas torn.
Far off the shores their sweeping circle wind;
And Clauda's isle, last hope! retreats behind.
Dark are the thoughts that all his prospects close,
Dark as the clouds that night around him throws.
Ill-fated night! which knew no friendly ray,
No coming dawn to light it into day.
Full many a sun attain'd its noon-day height,
Full many a cloud still made that noon-day night.
Scarce darker then, when weeping Israel dwelt
In Goshen's vale, thrice three-fold night was felt.
His blood-stain'd crimes the vanquish'd monarch own'd;
And Egypt darken'd, as Jehovah frown'd.
Now yields the bark; up heaves each batter'd beam,
And gapes, and sucks the wave at every seam.
The daunted sailors crowd the floating deck,
And reel and stagger on the shapeless wreck.
Close to the mast, where yet a mast they find,
The tatter'd remnants of the sails they bind.
The boat far-tossing some more vent'rous seize,
And strive with bands the laboring keel to ease.
Their sinewy limbs with ceaseless labor sink,
And at each pore the briny torrent drink.

Pale Fear presides: Death's thousand phantoms all
In terror view—except the godlike Paul.
He, undismay'd, mid frowning horrors stood,
As some tall rock that dares the angry flood.
Yet much he mus'd, yet much in secret scann'd
The darksome wonders of Jehovah's hand:
Yet oft he sigh'd, oft griev'd his race half run,
His frustrate hopes, and works of love undone;
A church just rising back to ruin hurl'd,
Which else had triumph'd o'er an heathen world.
The mighty Father view'd the struggling Saint,
And mark'd his grief unmingled with complaint.
Straight through the azure vault, on flaming wings,
A star-crown'd seraph the glad message brings.
Full to the ship he bent his train of light;
Th' Apostle knew, and gladden'd at the sight.
" Fear not," he heard th' angelic voice proclaim,
" Fear not, thou herald of a Saviour's name.
" Still o'er thy head is stretch'd th' Eternal's arm,
" Whose matchless shield can guard from every harm.
" Still must thou reach secure thy destin'd home,
" And stand His witness in Imperial Rome.
" And lo! thy faith hath gain'd the rebel host;
" No life shall perish, not an hair be lost."—
Reviving hope illum'd the Prophet's breast,
Each doubt enlighten'd, and each care suppress'd;
Through every limb a thrill before unus'd
' Sense of new joy ineffable diffus'd.'
Not so the rest: to them no hope appear'd,
No light was seen, no friendly voice was heard.
Twice seven times now had dawn'd the hopeless morn;
As oft the moon had roll'd her blunted horn;
Still are they toss'd, far toss'd on Adria's tide,
Still shoreless billows roar on every side.
The pitying Prophet marks their haggard air,
By famine sunk, and blasted by despair.
" O Sirs," at length, " what unbelief" he cries,
" Could challenge thus the justice of the skies?
" Else had ye press'd Lasea's slighted shore,
" And slept secure through dreary winter's roar.
" Yet Mercy still for you hath stretch'd her hand,
" And stay'd the stroke stern Justice would demand.
" Creation's God, whose sacred name I bear,
" Hath deign'd to listen to his servant's prayer:
" And thus his voice propitious from above
" Reveals the purpose of returning love:—
" ' Though wreck'd your ship, revers'd your impious boast
" ' No life shall perish, not an hair be lost.'

" Hence then, and ease your labor's weary length;
" With genial food recruit your wasted strength.
" It comes! it comes! I see the hop'd repose:
" The destin'd island waits to soothe your woes."
His cheering accents such sweet influence shed,
As evening dews distil on Hermon's head:
Whilst on his brow such heavenly mildness shone,
As angels beam, who weep a race undone.
Soon mid the crew the mingling murmur grows;
New sense of guilt, yet mix'd with hope, arose.
Lovely he seems, whom late they thought forlorn;
Lovely those lips, which late they doom'd to scorn.
On each rude visage rising blushes flame,
And all the conscious lineaments of shame.
Humbly they weep the guilty path they trod,
And bend in prostrate silence to their God.
All-fruitful Penitence! what pangs are thine!
What hopes, what terrors, crowd thy sainted shrine!
But chief thou'rt known, if 'chance some Warner near
(Whilst saints unseen and angels stoop to hear)
In sounds resistless urge the high behoof,
And pour the balmy med'cine of reproof.
What wonders then, what mingling tumults rise!
What griefs, which claim their kindred with the skies!
A warmer stream the flowing eyes impart,
A deeper sorrow vibrates at the heart.
Then Memory faithful kindles all her pain;
Conscience, that slept, then wakes her busy train.
Fled are the dreams of Night, her darkness fled;
Starts the rous'd soul, once number'd with the dead.
Such hopes, such terrors wrung the guilty crew;
Such light o'er all their mental vision grew.
Yet gloomy night still curtains o'er their head,
As on the deck their hasty meal they spread.
The grateful Saint, with fervent eyes uplift,
The Giver owns, and sanctifies the gift.
Soon snatch'd each meagre hand a quick repast;
What yet remain'd secure away they cast.
" Now slack the course—now bid the plummet heave"—
The shelving shores scarce twenty fathoms leave.
High from the deck the shouts instinctive mount;
They sound again, and less by five they count.
" Now drop the anchors: bind the shatter'd helm:
" Invite the morn, and view the wish'd-for realm."
The morn arrives—tall Malta's towering steep
Bursts full to view, and darkens all the deep.
They shout! they rush! and soon the vessel steer
Where parting rocks disclose a shelter near:

Each glist'ning eye the glad arrival hails—
But fails as soon, each op'ning prospect fails—
Lo! eddying tides now thick around them play,
And fierce contending currents force their way.
Whirl'd round and round, the giddy vessel flies
O'er rock, o'er surf—then sudden bulging lies,
A hopeless wreck: unnumber'd fragments strow
The waves; and planks and men promiscuous flow.
Dire was the shriek: but soon, the danger o'er,
Each seiz'd his plank, and reach'd the destin'd shore.
Safe mid the rest the faithful Hero lay,
And hov'ring angels watch'd his boist'rous way.
Hence then, my doubts! my dark misgivings, hence!
These are thy ways, mysterious Providence!
Deep as the Ocean-springs their track they hide,
And most prevail where most to sight denied.
In thickest shades thy steps their march perform,
Girt with the wind, and borne upon the storm.
Confusion's self is order in thy sight;
'All discord harmony, all darkness light.'
Shall man, vain man, oppose his Maker's praise?
Shall mortal hands th' apostate standard raise?
E'en fiercest foes ne'er pass thy fixt decree;
And proudest hands but weave a crown for thee:
Crowns thee each faithless act; each dark design,
Itself defeating, prospers only thine.
E'en Vice triumphant owns thy matchless skill,
And Freedom's self but executes thy will.
No more I doubt: far other prospects fire,
Far other visions all my lay inspire.
New scenes arise; new glories fill my eye;
And stands confest th' apparent Deity.
'Tis He! 'tis He! in vain the tempests lower,
Clouds interpose, and all their darkness pour.
Through darkest storms shoots forth th' Eternal ray,
Dispels each rising cloud, and all is day.
Yes! by that look serene, that heavenly smile,
Those beams of love that every fear beguile,
I know the God; I know each purpose there,
A Father's fondness, and a Shepherd's care.
Mild is that hand that soothes his people's woes,
That feeds his flock, and leads them to repose.
Those piercing eyes eternal vigils keep,
That guide them waking, and that guard their sleep.
Cease then your fears, ye Saints! th' uplifted rod
In silence kiss, and dare to trust your God.
Bold in his strength, with loudest dangers cope;
Smile e'en in tears, and mid despairing hope.

See Heaven for you its boundless all expand!
See Earth obedient work at your command!
The coward hills at your approach give way,
And yawning Ocean vomits forth his prey.
Recoiling lions fly the shield of truth;
Crush'd the red dragon, blunt the serpent's tooth.
And thou, dread Providence! whose awful name
Extends through all eternity the same;
To farthest ages kind alike to all,
The God of Jacob, and the God of Paul;
Still now, e'en now, thy mystic love unfold,
And guard thy saints, as thou didst guard of old.
But chief for him each dark event dispose,
Whate'er his name, and all thyself disclose,
Who, fir'd with holy love, at thy command,
Greatly obedient, tempts some distant land,
To sound thy truth, the message of the sky,
And give unbought what worlds could never buy!
Where'er he roams, whate'er sequester'd spot
Holds his rude couch, or hides his turf-clad cot;
Whether he treads the sultry shores that pine
Betwixt red Cancer and the burning Line;
Or where the solid wave forgets to roar,
Round Greenland's coasts, or frozen Labrador;
O beam, Celestial! with thy brightest ray,
And light him lonely on his devious way!
Still round his path with tenderest care assuage
The siroc's poison, and the lightning's rage;
Each dire extreme that shudd'ring Nature shuns,
Siberian frosts, and Abyssinian suns.
If dark suspense e'er cloud his drooping eye,
Or sad remembrance heave one struggling sigh;
If, holy hope just glimmering in his breast,
Dim, and remote, he view the promis'd rest;
Shine inward then! O chase the cheerless gloom,
Fountain of Light! bid Eden's fairest bloom
Spring in the wild; anoint his eyes to see
In heaven his home, and every friend in thee!
But when mid list'ning crowds the preacher stands,
Heaven's high behest in his uplifted hands,
Give him, unfolding all his bright design
In the full stream of eloquence divine,
To bend obedient nations to his call,
Firm, faithful, zealous, emulous of Paul.

CHARLES JAMES HOARE, A. M.
ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

INSTANCE OF ARABIAN FORGERY.

On perusing Mr. Thomas Taylor's *Dissertation on the Philosophy of Aristotle*, which accompanies his translation of Aristotle's works, the following instance of Arabian forgery extracted from that work appearing to me to be no less novel than singular, I thought it deserved a place in your *Journal*, particularly as this Dissertation is but in the hands of a few, and you will therefore oblige many of your readers by inserting it, besides

AMICUS.

Having therefore shown by extracts from the works of Albertus Magnus, as a specimen, instar omnium, to what a great extent the writings of the Greek philosophers, and particularly those of Aristotle, were perverted by the schoolmen, in consequence of their becoming acquainted with them through the medium of translations from the Arabic, I shall conclude my collection of instances of Arabian fraud, with those which I have discovered in the 14 books ascribed to Aristotle, De Secretiore Parte Divinæ Sapientiæ secundum Ægyptios, or *On the more secret part of divine wisdom according to the Egyptians.* This work is said to have been found at Damascus, and to have been translated from Greek into Arabic, and from Arabic into Latin, in the last of which languages it is extant in the editions of Aristotle's works by Casaubon and Du Vall. Fabricius justly conjectures that this work is supposititious; but neither he nor any other critic has demonstrated that it is so. From the following extracts, however, it will appear that it is in a great measure compiled from the works of Plotinus, though what is extracted from the writings of that philosopher is barbarized as is usual with the Arabians; for this work, instead of being a translation first from Greek into Arabic, was doubtless originally an Arabian forgery. A few of these extracts both from Plotinus and the Arabian treatise, I shall translate for the sake of the English reader, and refer the learned reader to other passages of the languages in which they are extant.

In the first place then the following passage from cap. iv. lib. 1. appears to have been barbarized from the beginning of the 8th book of the 4th Ennead of Plotinus. "Ego sæpius animo contemplans relicto corpore visus sum perfrui summo bono cum voluptate incredibili. Quare hæsi quodammodo attonitus, agnoscens me esse partem quandam superioris mundi, atque adeptum sentiens vitæ immortalitatem, sub luce maxima: quæ neque oratione exprimi potest, neque auribus percipi, neque cogitatione comprehendi. Tandem vero hac contemplatione defessus, intellectus re-

cidit in phantasiam, tumque, illa luce deficiente, factus sum tristior. Rursus relicto corpore, eo reversus deprehendi animum luce abundantem, hunc que tum in corpus influentem, tum supra hoc excitatum. Hæc igitur Plato." The words of Plotinus are as follow : πολλακις εγειρομενος εις εμαυτον εκ του σωματος, και γινομενος των μεν αλλων εξω, εμαυτου δε εισω, θαυμαστον ηλικον οργων καλλος, και της κρειττονος μοιρας πιστευσας τοτε μαλιστα ειναι ζωην τε αριστην ενεργειαν ελθων εκεινην, υπερ παν τε αλλο νοητον εμαυτον ιδρυσας, μετα ταυτην την εν τω θειω στασιν, εις λογισμον εκ νου καταβας, απορω πως ποτε και νυν καταβαινω, και οπως ποτε μοι ενδον η ψυχη γεγενηται του σωματος, τουτο ουσα οιον εφανη καθ' εαυτην, καιπερ ουσα εν σωματι. i. e. " Frequently when excited from body to myself, and becoming external to other things, but within or converted to myself, I perceive a most admirable beauty, and believe myself to be a partaker of a more excellent allotment; for then especially I energize according to the best life, and becoming the same with divinity, and being firmly fixed in it, I arrive at an energy by which I establish myself above every other intelligible. But after this establishment in divinity, descending from intellect into the discursive energy of reason, I am dubious how formerly and now I descended, and how my soul once became situated within the body, being such [i. e. so pure] as it appears to be in itself, though connected with body." The intelligent reader need not, I trust, be told that the former of these extracts is derived from the latter, nor how much the beautiful passage of Plotinus is deformed and barbarized by the Arabian plagiary.

Again, in the following extract, the Arabian author uses frequently the very words of Plotinus. The extract is from the latter part of the 5th chapter of the first book. " Plato igitur olim plura animo attribuit quæ nos ex ejus viva voce excepimus: sed ea non sunt ab illo literarum monumentis mandata: ex quibus alioqui facile lector hujus mentem deprehendisset. Ejusmodi autem attributa diversa sunt. Quoniam intellectus cum sensu conjungitur, nec in omnibus hunc despicit, sed conjunctionem cum corpore: a quo ligatus peneque extinctus detinetur. Animus enim in hoc, ut in loco est,[1] sicut etiam Anticles arbitratur: sed amplius hoc addit, corpus illius esse carcerem. Ex quo etiam a Platone dictum est animum corpore solutum ascendere atque illustrari: eundem descendentem obscurari, sed postea purgatum rursum ascendere. Hujus autem descensus causæ sunt permultæ. Quarum

[1] Here the memory of the Arabian plagiary failed him; for it is well known to be a dogma universally received by the Platonists that the soul is not in the body as in place. For being incorporeal it is impossible that it should be contained locally in the body.

prima in peccato est, ut scilicet pro eo pœnas det, nonnihilque promereatur, atque dei leges subeat. Alii ob aliam causam descendunt, quam ille non commemorat. Sed colligens animi descensum execratur: additque, quoniam mundus hic substantiæ suæ præstantiam quandam habet et excellentiam, in eo animum extare oportere, devincto intellectu, quemadmodum in superiore mundo idem sempiternus habetur. Non enim rationi consentaneum ut mundus hic, latissime patens et perfecte conformatus, intellectus sit expers. Neque vero hujus particeps esse potuit, nisi in eodem animus antecederet. Quare summus opifex animum cum illo conjunxit, et cum ea animi parte, cujus est ratio, species permiscuit. Siquidem animi partes sine quadam dissensione inter se minime esse videntur. De quibus in plantis paucæ sunt, in belluis plures, in homine plurimæ. Ut iste mundus suam perfectionem habeat, quanquam ei, quæ in superiore est, minime parem. Quia ab illo conformatus est, omnisque interitus originem continet. Quare mundo in sensum cadenti inesse oportet ea etiam animalium genera, quæ intelligibili insunt."

The passage of Plotinus, from which the Arabian plagiary has evidently taken all this, is the following, and forms the latter part of the above cited Chap. 1. Book 8th of the 4th Ennead, *On the descent of the soul into bodies.* λειπεται δε ημιν ο θειος πλατων, ος πολλα τε και καλα περι ψυχης ειπε. περι τε αφιξεως αυτης πολλαχη ειρηκεν εν τοις αυτου λογοις, ωστε ελπιδα ημιν ειναι λαβειν παρ' αυτου σαφες τι. τι ουν λεγει ο φιλοσοφος αυτος; ου ταυτον λεγων πανταχη φαινεται, ινα αν τις εκ ραδιας το του ανδρος βουλημα ειδεν. αλλα το αισθητον παν πανταχου ατιμασας, και την προς το σωμα κοινωνιαν της ψυχης μεμψαμενος, εν δεσμῳ τε ειναι, και τεθαφθαι εν αυτῳ την ψυχην λεγει, και τον εν απορρητοις λεγομενον λογον μεγαν ειναι, ος εν φρουρᾳ την ψυχην φησιν ειναι. και το σπηλαιον αυτῳ ωσπερ Εμπεδοκλει το αντρον, τοδε το παν δοκῳ μοι λεγουσιν, οπου γε λυσιν των δεσμων και ανοδον εκ του σπηλαιου τῃ ψυχῃ φησιν ειναι, την προς το νοητον πορειαν. εν δε φαιδρῳ πτερορρυησιν, αιτιαν της ενταυθα αφιξεως· και περιοδοι αυτης ανελθουσαν παλιν φερουσι τηδε. και κρισεις δε καταπεμπουσιν αλλας ενταυθα, και κληροι, και τυχαι, και αναγκαι. και εν τουτοις απασι μεμψαμενος την της ψυχης αφιξιν προς σωμα. εν τιμαιῳ περι τουδε του παντος λεγων, τον τε κοσμον επαινει, και θεον λεγει ειναι ευδαιμονα. την τε ψυχην παρα αγαθου του δημιουργου προς το εννουν τοδε το παν ειναι δεδοσθαι. επειδη εννουν μεν αυτο εδει ειναι, ανευ δε ψυχης, ουχ οιον τε ειναι τουτο γενεσθαι. ητε ουν ψυχη η του παντος τουτου χαριν εις αυτο παρα του θεου επεμφθη. ητι εκαστου ημων, προς το τελεον αυτο ειναι. επειδη εδει οσον εν νοητῳ κοσμῳ, τα αυτα ταυτα γενη ζωων, και εν τῳ αισθητῳ υπαρχειν. i. e. "The divine Plato remains, who has said many and beautiful things about the soul, and has spoken in many parts of his works about its descent, so that we may hope to receive from

him something perspicuous about it. What therefore does this philosopher say? It does not indeed appear that he every where says the same thing on this subject, so that any one may easily apprehend his meaning; but he every where despises the whole of a sensible nature, and blames the association of the soul with the body. He likewise asserts that the soul is fettered and buried in the body, and considers what is said in the mysteries as a thing of great importance, viz. that the soul is in the present life as in a prison secured by a guard. A cave also with him in the same manner as with Empedocles appears to me to signify this universe; and he says that a liberation from the bonds, and an ascent from the cave, is a progression to the intelligible. But in the Phædrus he says that the defluxion of the wings of the soul is the cause of its descent hither. Certain periods likewise cause the soul which has ascended again to tend to the earth. Judgments also, and allotments, and fortunes, and necessities, send other souls [into these lower regions]. And in all these places, he blames the descent of the soul into body. In the Timæus, however, speaking about this universe, he praises the world, and says that it is a blessed god; and that soul was imparted to the universe by the beneficent demiurgus, in order that the universe might be a partaker of intellect; since it is necessary that it should be intellectual, but it is not possible for it to become so without soul. The soul of the universe therefore was for this purpose imparted to the world, and also each of our souls, in order that the world might be perfect; since it is necessary that there should be as many, and the same genera of animals in the sensible, as there are in the intelligible world."

In the following passages also the plagiarism of the Arabian author is very apparent. In Cap. 4. Lib. 4. he observes: "Duplex mundus ita se habet, ut is qui solo intellectu percipitur altero in sensum cadente superior sit. Quoniam ille hujus causa est, et in eundem sua virtute influit. Quibus similitudine quadam respondent lapides duo: de quibus unus summa arte exculptus est, alter rudis et informis. In iis enim unus altero perfectior non eo ipso quo lapis est (uterque enim lapis dicitur) sed quia ea forma ornatus cujus artificium non inerat materiæ: sed artificis mente prius comprehendebatur quam in lapide efformaretur. Artificium autem inest statuario, non quia oculatus est aut pedibus manibusve præditus, sed quia statuarius artis suæ peritus est per quam indicat quid faciendum. Eidemque formæ communes insunt: ipse vero formas singulas effingit hasque pulchras reddit. Quare ipsa ars in artifice nobilior est quam in opere. Neque forma secundum essentiam eadem in artifice est quæ postea in lapide: sed illa constans permanet, ab eaque artificis industria

alia in materiam influit quæ alterius pulchritudinem assequuta non est, neque pro conatu artificis absoluta, sed pro materiæ capacitate."

The passage in Plotinus from which the above is obviously taken is the beginning of the 8th book of the 5th Ennead, and is as follows: περιραθωμεν ιδειν και ειπειν ημιν αυτοις, ως οιον τε τα τοιαυτα ειπειν, πως αν τις το καλλος του νου και του κοσμου εκεινου (i. e. νοητου) θεασαιτο. κειμενων τοινυν αλληλων εγγυς, εστω δε ει βουλει λιθων εν ογκω, του μεν αρυθμιστου και τεχνης αμοιρου, του δε ηδη τεχνη κεκρατημενου εις αγαλμα θεου, η και τινος ανθρωπου. θεου μεν, χαριτος η τινος μουσης· ανθρωπου δε, μη τινος, αλλ' ου εκ παντων καλων πεποιηκεν η τεχνη. φανειη μεν αν, ο υπο της τεχνης γεγενημενος εις ειδους καλλος, καλος ου παρα το ειναι λιθος. ην γαρ αν, και ο ετερος καλος ομοιως, αλλα παρα του ειδους, ο ενηκεν η τεχνη. τουτο μεν τοινυν το ειδος, ουκ ειχεν η υλη, αλλ' ην εν τω νοησαντι, και πριν ελθειν εις τον λιθον. ην δε εν τω δημιουργω, ου καθοσον οφθαλμοι η χειρες ησαν αυτω, αλλ' οτι μετειχε της τεχνης. ην αρα εν τη τεχνη το καλλος τουτο, αμεινον πολλω. ου γαρ εκεινο ηλθεν εις τον λιθον το εν τη τεχνη, αλλ' εκεινο μεν μενει, αλλο δε απ' εκεινης ελαττον εκεινου. και ουδε τουτο εμεινε καθαρον εν αυτω, ουδε οιον εβουλετο, αλλ' οσον ειχεν ο λιθος τη τεχνη. i. e. "Let us endeavour to perceive and narrate to ourselves, as far as it is possible to speak of such things, how the beauty of intellect and the intelligible world may be surveyed. Let it then be supposed that there are two stony masses placed near each other, the one being rude and destitute of art, but the other being now fashioned by art into the statue of some god or man. And if indeed it is the statue of a divinity, let it be that of one of the Graces or Muses; but if of a man, let it not be the statue of any individual, but that which art has made from an assemblage of all beautiful [human forms]. The stone therefore, which has been fashioned by art into the beauty of form, will indeed appear to be beautiful, not because it is a stone; for if this were the case the other stone would be similarly beautiful; but its beauty will be derived from the form which was inserted into it by art. The matter therefore had not this form, but it was in the conception of the artist, before it came into the stone. It was, however, in the artist, not so far as he had eyes and hands, but because he participated of art. This beauty therefore was in art much superior [to that which is in the statue]. For the beauty, which was in art, did not proceed into the stone, but that indeed remained in the artist, and another beauty of an inferior kind was derived from it. Nor did even this remain pure in itself, or such as the artist wished it to be, but such as the stone was capable of receiving."

The following likewise are instances of obvious plagiarism in the Arabian author. "Ponendum igitur pro exemplo id quod ad intel-

lectum pertinet. Ac ut auri portio quæ alterius rei significationem est habitura, si immunda sit, repurgatur, vel omnino vel certe quodammodo; ut aurum vere sit, non extrinsecus tantum apparens, sed in interioribus etiam suæ substantiæ partibus, præditum omnibus auri qualitatibus, sic nobis nunc faciendum est dum essentiam primam per intellectum tanquam per imaginem explicare conamur." Lib. 4. Cap. 6. The words of Plotinus from which the above passage is taken are: αλλα γαρ δει την εικονα εκ νου γενεσθαι, ωστε μη δι' εικονος, αλλ' οιον χρυσου παντος, χρυσον τινα δειγμα λαβειν. και ει μη καθαρος ειη ο ληφθεις, καθαιρειν αυτον, η εργῳ η λογῳ, δεικνυντας, ως ου παν τουτο εστι χρυσος, αλλα του τι το εν τῳ ογκῳ μονον. i. e. "For it is necessary that the image [of intellect] should be derived from intellect, so as that we may not speak of it through an image; but as if we received a certain piece of gold as a specimen of all gold. And if the portion which is received is not pure, it must be purified either in reality, or in words; demonstrating that this is not the whole of gold, but a certain portion of it only in bulk." Ennead 5. lib. 8.

Again, immediately after the above passage, we have in the Arabian author: "Sumendus enim est is intellectus qui perfectissime est repurgatus. Ad cujus cognitionem si quis aspirat, ea in spiritibus est quærenda. Siquidem hi puri sunt et inexplicabilem habent venustatem: quoniam nihil nisi intellectus sunt.—Spirituum enim pulchritudo summa est. Quoniam sine ullo errore semper pureque intelligunt, resque cognoscunt, non ut humano labore inventas, sed ut divina voluntate detectas." This is most obviously barbarized from the following passage of Plotinus in the above cited chapter. ουτω και ενταυθα απο νου του εν ημιν κεκαθαρμενου. ει δε βουλει απο των θεων, οιος εστιν ο εν αυτοις νους. σεμνοι μεν γαρ παντες θεοι και καλοι, και το καλλος αυτων αμηχανον.—ου γαρ δη ποτε μεν φρονουσιν, ποτε δε αφρονουσιν, αλλ' αει φρονουσιν εν απαθει τῳ νῳ και στασιμῳ και καθαρῳ· και ισασι παντα, και γινωσκουσιν, ου τα ανθρωπινα, αλλα τα εαυτων τα θεια, και οσα νου; ορα. i. e. "Thus also here let us ascend from the now purified intellect which is in us. And if you are willing, let us begin from the gods, and consider what kind of intellect it is which is in them. For all the gods indeed are venerable and beautiful, and their beauty is immense. For they are not indeed at one time wise, and at another destitute of wisdom, but they are always wise, in an impassive, stable and pure intellect; and they know all things, not merely such as are humaa, but their own concerns, viz. such as are divine, and such as intellect perceives."

The following passage from the Arabian is remarkable for its plagiarism, because it contains a dogma peculiar to Plotinus, viz. that something belonging to the soul perpetually remains in the

intelligible world, even while the soul is connected with this terrestrial body. In the 8th chapter of the 7th book, the Arabian author observes: "Quod animus non omnino descendit in mundum inferiorem, nec is qui communis est, nec qui humanus: sed ejus aliquid supersit in mundo altero qui intelligibilis est, ab illoque minime translatus est, quia loco non indiget." Compare this with the beginning of the last chapter of the 8th book of the 4th Ennead of Plotinus; και ει χρη παρα δοξαν των αλλων τολμησαι το φαινομενον λεγειν σαφεστερον, ου πασα ουδ' η ημετερα ψυχη εδυ, αλλ' εστι τι αυτης εν τω νοητω αει. i. e. "And if I may be bold enough to assert more clearly what appears to me to be the truth, contrary to the opinions of others, neither does the whole of our soul enter into the body, but there is something belonging to it, which always remains in the intelligible world."

In the following passage, also, the plagiarism is remarkably obvious: "Quandoquidem quæ in eo sunt [i. e. in mundo intelligibili] abundant ubertate, robore atque lætitia, utpote quæ in vita sublimia sunt, et ab uno fonte derivata, unaque qualitate prædita quæ ceteras in se est complexa: ut sapores dulces, odores suaves, colores perspicuos, concordes sonos, et rerum tactilium differentias, ceterasque perfectiones." Lib. 8. Cap. 3. μη δε μιας εκει πενιας, μηδ' αποριας ουσης, αλλα παντων ζωης πεπληρωμενων, και οιον ζεοντων· εστι δ' αυτων οιον η ρωη, εκ μιας πηγης, ουχ οιον ενος τινος πνευματος, η θερμοτητος μιας, αλλ' οιον ει τις ην ποιοτης μια, πασας εν αυτη εχουσα, και σωζουσα τας ποιοτητας, γλυκυτητος μετ' ευωδιας, και ομου οινωδης ποιοτητος, και χυλων απαντων δυναμεις, και χρωματων οψεις, και οσαι αφαι γινωσκουσιν· εστωσαν δε και οσα ακοαι ακουουσι, και ρυθμος πας. i. e. "There is no penury there, nor any defect, but all things are full of life, and, as it were, fervid. But there is one efflux of them, as it were, from one fountain; not as if from one certain spirit, or one heat, but as if there was one quality, containing and preserving in itself all qualities, viz. sweetness, together with fragrance, a vinous quality, the powers of all juices, and the splendor of colors, together with such things as are known by the touch. Let there, likewise, be there every thing that is audible, and all rhythm." Ennead 6. lib. 7. Cap. 12.

The following passage, likewise, is evidently taken from Plotinus: "Ut enim viator natura terrenus, terra iter facit, quæque e terra oriuntur, terrena sunt, quanquam maxima varietate distincta; sic omnia, quæ in illa vitali regione moventur, vitali quoque motu cientur, eademque sunt vitalia." Lib. 8. Cap. 5. The words of Plotinus are: παν δε δια ζωης η πορεια, και δια ζωων παν· ωσπερ και το δια γης ιοντι, παντα α διεξεισι γη, καν διαφορας εχη

η γη· και εκει η μεν ζωη δι' ης η αυτη. i. e. "The whole of the progression [in the intelligible world] is through life, and through animals; just as to him who travels through the earth, all that occurs is earth, though the earth is distinguished by differences. And there, also, the life, through which the progression is made, is the same."

Compare also the beginning of the 21st Chap. of the 12th book with the end of the 12th Chap. of the first book of the 5th Ennead of Plotinus; the whole of the 11th Chap. of the 14th book, with the 4th Chap. of the 8th book of the 5th Ennead; and the 14th and 15th Chapters of the 14th book, with the 6th and 7th Chapters of the same book of the same Ennead, and you will find indubitable proofs of the plagiarism of the Arabian author. In short, the whole fourteen books will be found, on diligent inspection, to be nothing more than a barbarized Collectanea from the works of Plotinus.

Very judicious therefore is the remark of Dr. Friend,[1] "That it is a fault common to all the editors of the Arabian writers, as well as of those who have written expositions on them, to magnify indifferently, and without any distinction, this or that author, as an original, and as one who has peculiar excellencies in him. *Few of them inform us where they borrowed from the Greeks, and scarce one of them seems to apprehend, how much they stole from one another.*" That this indeed should be the case with the Arabian writers posterior to the era of Mahomet, is by no means wonderful. For the character of a people must principally depend on the religion they profess; and as that of Mahomet may be considered as the consummation of imposture, it naturally follows that the professors of it will be consummately fraudulent.

DE CARMINIBUS ARISTOPHANIS COMMENTARIUS,

AUCTORE G. B.

Pars IV.—[Vid. No. XXVIII. p. 240.]

Ex octo fabulis, quas duobus tomis Brunckius dispertivit, sex mihi sunt ad examen vocatæ; et singulis quibusque versus probe aut probabiliter restitutos composui, labori minus quam ingenio confisus. Eandem a me vel oblectationem studiorum vel exercitationem expetunt duæ Comœdiæ, multo minus propter difficultates

[1] In his History of Physic, Vol. 2. p. 125.

Cantuum notandæ, quam Diverbiorum. In utroque etenim dramate hiatus sunt non pauci; magna etiam personarum confusio; plurimi quoque sales interpretibus non satis intellecti; neque exiguus est locorum numerus, ubi non nisi ope facis Criticæ, lucem aliquatenus dubiam præbentis, tenebræ discuti possunt denuissimæ. Verum res istiusmodi tractare neque volo nec possum. De Cantibus etenim Choricis mihi in animo est hodie anquirere: neque levem operam essent daturæ Lysistrata et Vespæ: nisi quis mecum reperisset proprium esse aliquid Antistrophis, suam quoque Epodis formam. En carmina ab aliis et a me detecta. In Lysistrata, juxta editionem Brunckianam, exstant

256 et sqq. *στρ. α'.*
271 et sqq. *ἀντιστρ. α'.*
286 et sqq. *στρ. β'.*
296 et sqq. *ἀντιστρ. β'.*

} Hæc antistrophica dispescuerunt Bentl. et Brunck. Ibi leviter errata sic corrige. *Μοχλοῖσι κλῇσιν καὶ θύρκῃσι*, vice *Μοχλοῖσιν δὲ καὶ κλῄθροισιν.* Sic enim Rav. at vulgo *Μοχλοῖς δὲ καὶ κλῄθροισι*: quocum confer Androm. 943. *Κλείθροισι καὶ μοχλοῖσι*: sed *κλῇσι*, ni fallor, tuebitur Lys. 487. *Ὅτι βουλόμεναι τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν ἀπεκλείσατε μοχλοῖς*: modo suppleas, collato Vesp. 154. *Καὶ τῆς κατακλείδος ἐπιμελοῦ καὶ τοῦ μοχλοῦ*, defectum versus legendo *κλῇσι μοχλοῖς τε.* Certe ibi voces *ἀκρόπολιν, τοῖς* et *οὕτως* sunt ex interpolatoribus non e Comici manu. Probe quidem scio Reisigium in Conjectaneis p. 210. tueri *τοῖσι μοχλοῖσι* ex *τοῖς λίθοις* in Vesp. 222. sed et ille ipse contulit in meas partes opportune Vesp. 114. *Μοχλοῖσιν ἐγκλείσαντες*, omisso *τοῖς*. Mox vice *ὄχεῖ' ὅπλα παράδους ἐμοὶ Σμικρὸν ἔχων πάνυ τριβώνιον*, lege [*ωχ*]*ηεν θ' ὅπλα παράδους ἐμοὶ Σμικρίν τι πάνυ τριβώνιον.* Cui conjecturæ eximie favet MS. lectio apud Bentleium, *ωχηεν θ' ὅπλα*— Etenim *ωχ* compendiose scriptum est pro *ὤχετο*, quod exhibent MSS. alii, e gl. pro *ᾔειν*: id verbum, Comicis fere proprium, sæpe depravari monet Elmsleius ad Suppl. 752. in *Classical Journal*, No. xvii. p. 51. et ibi allegato Plut. 696. *Ὁ δὲ θεὸς ὑμῖν οὐ προσῄειν*; *Οὐδέπω*· emendat *προσῆειν* propter 678. *μετὰ τοῦτο δὲ Πεῤῥιῆς τοὺς βωμούς*: quomodo et Antiphanem apud Athen. p. 15. A. *Φαινίνδα παίζων ᾔειε ἐν Φαινεστίου* emendaverat Valcken. ad Phœn. 1082. legendo *ᾔειν εἰς Φαινεστίου*. Dein, cum *TI* exciderit ob *Π* in *Πάνυ*, propter metrum nescio quis intulit *ἔχων*: at longe facetius, omisso *ἔχων*, dicitur Cleomenes nihil aliud habuisse, quod traderet, præter pallium, vere Laconicum. In hac re etenim mores Spartanos tetigit Comicus, ut Plato apud Aspasium, ad Ethic. Nicomach. iv. 7. p. 58. *α*. *Οἶον ἡ τῶν Λακώνων ἐσθὴς εὐτελὴς ἄγαν ἱστορεῖται Ξενοφῶντι· διὰ ταῦτα καὶ σκύπτουσιν αὐτοὺς οἱ κωμῳδοποιοι, ὡς Πλάτων ἐν Πρέσβεσι. Χαίροις οἶμαι μεταπεττεύσας αὐτὸν διακλιμακίσας τε Τὸν ὑπηνόβιον σπαρτιοχαίτην, ὑποκόνδυλον ἑλκετρίβωνα.* Ubi corrige *Χαῖρ', ὦ, ζῶμον μεταπεττεύσας σκότιον*: et lege Toupiana ad Suid. in. p. 79. *de jure nigro Laconum*: at quid sit illud nigrum jus in loco, ubi commemoratur aliquis *τινὰ διακλιμάκισαι*, intelligas ope Pac. 986.

Verum hæc obiter. Ad nostrum redeo. De formula *σμικρόν τι* vid. Porson. Adversar. p. 109. Denique post *πινῶν ῥυπῶν*, vix subjungi potest *ἀπαράτιλτος* sine *ὧν*: vide Porson. ad Hec. 786. lege igitur *πινῶν ῥυπῶν ὧν τ' ἀπαράτιλτος Ἐξ ἐτῶν τ' ἄλουτος*: adeo ut *ἓξ ἐτῶν* bis repetatur.

321 et sqq. *στρ.* } Ita Hermann. de Metr. p. 313.=428 et sic
335 et sqq. *ἀντιστρ.* } fere Bentl.; sed neuter vidit veram esse lectionem *Πόλει τε βάρος πῶς τριταλαντ—ιαῖον ἀπειλοῦντας ἐπῶν*: et in strophicis *ὑπαὶ* bis vice *ὑπὸ* propter Ach. 969. et Av. 1426. *ὑπαὶ πτερύγων*. Quod ad *πόλει ἀπειλοῦντας*, cf. S. C. Th. 422. et 545. *Πύργους δ' ἀπειλεῖ δεῖν*: ubi, sicut apud Comicum *δεινότατ'*, irrepsit bis *δεῖν* vice *δρᾶν* in altero Æschyli loco, et *τοῖσδ'* in altero: ut satis liquet e variis lectionibus. Quod ad *τριταλαντιαῖον*, cf. Hesych. *Ταλαντιαῖον, βαρύ*: necnon *Ἀμαξιαῖα πράγματα* apud Phrynich. Arab. p. 24. *Μναϊαῖον* ex Athen. iii. p. 89. *A.* et Eustath. Od. *T.* p. 715, 18. *Bas.* et *Στατηριαῖον* apud Polluc. ix. 60.

476 et sqq.

Ζεῦ, τί ποτε
χρησόμεθα
τοῖσδε τοῖσι κνωδάλοις;
οὐ γάρ ἐστ' ἄνεκτα ταῦτ'·
ἀλλὰ βασα-
ιστέον
τόδε σοὶ τὸ πάθος μετ' ἐμοῦ,
ὅτι βουλόμεναί ποτε τὴν
Κρανάαν κατέλαβον,
ἐφ' ὅτι τε μεγαλόπετρ-
ον ἄβατον
ἀκρόπολιν
ἱερὸν
τέμενος.

V. 4. Vulgo *τάδ'*: at *ταῦτα* tuetur Thesm. 563. *Ταῦτα δῆτ' ἄνεκτ' ἀκούειν*. V. 7. *τὸ* male omisit Brunckius. Vid. Reisig. Conject. p. 177. qui cantum hunc et sequentem pro Antistrophis habet.

541 et sqq.

ἐγὼ γὰρ οὔποτ' ἄν γ'
ὀρχουμένη κάμοιμ',
οὐδὲ τὰ
γοῦνα κό-
πος ἕλοι με
καμάτηρος·
ἐθέλω δ' ἐπὶ πᾶν ἰέναι
μετὰ τῶν δ' ἀρετὴς ἔνεχ', αἷς
ἔνι φύσις ἔνι χάρις
ἔνι θράσος, ἔνι σόφον
ἔνι φιλόπολις
φρόνιμος ἀρετή.

V. 1. Vulgo abest *γ'*: quod sæpe *ἂν* comitatur. Vid. Erfurdt. ad Antig. 743. citantem Herc. F. 1196. Agam. 350. Vid. et Porson. ad Iph. T. 1217. Cum Reisigio consentit et Hermann. de Metr. p. 383. ed. 2. Et sane hæc Antistrophica esse possunt, modo legas *ὦ Ζεῦ—τοῖς δὲ κνωδάλοις* et *ἔτ' ἄνεκτα τάδε γ'* et *οὔποτ' ἂν κάμοιμ' ὀρχουμένη*, et *οὔτε γόνατ' ἂν κόπος ἕλοι με καματήριος* et *ἔνι δὲ τὸ σόφον* partim cum vulgatis, partim ex Hermanni meisque conjecturis.

614 et sqq. *στρ.* } Ita Hermann. de Metr. p. 358. ed. 1. et sic
636 et sqq. *ἀντιστρ.* } Bentl. Male igitur *ἐγὼ* in 625. delevit Brunck.

658 et sqq. *στρ.* } Ita Hermann. l. c. et Bentl.; lege igitur
682 et sqq. *ἀντιστρ.* } cum Mss. 2. *Ταῦτ' οὖν οὐχ* in 658.

781 et sqq. *στρ.* } Ita in Kust. edit. et sic Bentl.
805 et sqq. *ἀντιστρ.* }

1043 et sqq. *σύστημα, α'.* } Inter hæc esse vidit Hermann. de
1058 et sqq. ——— *β'.* } Metr. p. 369. et p. 113.=204, 5.
1189 et sqq. ——— *γ'.* } duo carmina Antistrophica: at
1203 et sqq. ——— *δ'.* } quatuor systemata Elmsleius et sic Bentl. qui ter Elmsleio præripuit emendationes in v. 1062., 1192. et 1212. Sed omnes eruditos elusit levis corruptela in v. 1051. et sqq. sic eluenda. *Εἴ τις ἀργυρίδιον δεῖ—ται, λαβεῖν μνᾶς δύ' ἢ τρεῖς, Ὡς πλέα 'στιν, Ἀχομεν, βαλάντια. Κἂν ποτ' εἰρήνη φανῇ, Ὅστις ἂν μνᾶν μοι δανείσῃ—ται, παρ' ἡμῶν Ἂν λάβῃ, μήκετ' ἀποδῶ.* Hic vulgantur *ὡς πόλλ' ἔσω 'στιν, κἀχομεν —— νυνὶ δανείσηται.* Reisigius in Conject. p. 317. emendare vult *τρεῖς, πολλὰ σᾶ 'στί*: quod facetum est: quasi Lysistrata dare potuisset aliquid e rebus non salvis. Ipse reposui *πλέα* vocem sæpe corruptam. In Thesm. 702. vulgo *Ὡς ἅπαντ' ἐστὶν τόλμης ἔργα κἀναισχυντίας*: at Ms. et Junt. *ἅπαν γάρ ἐστιν*: unde Bergler et Bentl. *ἅπαντ' ἄρ' ἐστι*: sed *ἅπαντα τόλμης πλέα κἀναισχυντίας*, exhibet Suid. in *Ἅπαντα*, unde erui potest *Ὡς ἅπαντ' ἔργ' ἐστὶ τόλμης καὶ πλέα 'ναισχυντίας*. Quocum opportune contulit Toupius ii. p. 443. e Sophocle *ἀναιδείας πλέαν*: et plura similia Blomfieldus ad Prom. 721. quibus adde ibid. 989. *Φρονήματος πλέως* et Herodot. vii. 47. *δείματος—ὑποπλέως*, et Ran. 1372. *ἀτοπίας πλέως*. Quo respexit Phrynich. Arab. p. 21. *Ἀτοπίας πλέως ἄνθρωπος. Χρῶ.* At Suid. *Ἀτοπίας πλέον πρᾶγμα.* Mox *ἄχομεν* est pro *ἃ ἔχομεν* sicut *ἂν* pro *ἃ ἀν*. Dein vice *νυνὶ*, quod friget admodum, reposui *μνᾶν μοι*. Denique in antitheticis lege *Ὥσπερ οἰκαῖ' εἰς ἑαυτῶν. Γαμικὸς, ὡς ἔοικεν, θύρα κεκλείσετ' οὔ*. Inepte vulgo *Γενικῶς ἴσως δ' ἡ θύρα κεκλείσεται*. Meam conjecturam illustrat mos satis notus veterum, qui fores claudere inter nuptias solebant. Cf. Theocrit. Idyll. xv. 77. *ἐνδοῖ πᾶσαι· ὁ τὰν νύον εἰπ' ἀποκλάξας*, et Catull. lvi. 231. *Claudite ostia, virgines. Παρὰ προσδοκίαν* igitur Lysistrata dicit *θύρα γαμικὸς οὐ κεκλείσεται, ὡς ἔοικεν*. Ubi *οὐ* a me restituitur, qua voce sæpe versus clauditur: vid. Tro. 1226. Herc. F. 1225. Med. 1230. Antig. 255. Phil. 545. El. 905. Postremo *δὴ* et *δεῖ* permutantur in Phœn. 1704.

1247 et sqq.

ὅρμαον
ὅρμαον
τοῖς κυρσανίαις
ὦ Μναμοσύνα
τὰν τεὰν
μῶαν, ἅ-
τις οἶδ' ἄμμ'
'Ασαναί-
ως τ', ὄκα
τοὶ μὲν ἐπ'
Ἄρταμι τίῳ πρό-
κρουον θείκελοι ποτ-
τὰ κᾶλα, τὼς
Μήδως τ' ἐνικ-

ἁσαμεν· ἄμμε δ' αὖ Λε-
ωνίδας ἄγεν, ἅπερ
τὼς κάπρως θήγ-
οντας ὀδὸν-
τὸν ὄδοντ-
α· πόλυς δ'
ἀμφὶ τὰς γένυας ἀφρὸς ἦνσ-
ει, πόλυς δ' ἄμα κατὰ σκελοῖν·
ἦν δὲ τῶνδρες
οὐκ ἐλάσσως
τᾶς ψάμμω
τοὶ Πέρσαι·

Ἀγρότερ' Ἄρταμι σηρ-
οκτόνε δεῦρο μόλ', ὦ,
ποττὰς σπονδὰς, ὡς συνέχῃς πόλυν
ἄμμε χρόνον· νῦν κἀν φιλίᾳ γ' ἀὲς
εὔπορος εἶῃς ταῖς
συνθήκαις, καὶ τᾶν
αἰμυλᾶν ἀλ-
ωπέκων παυ-
σαίμεθ'· ὦ,
δεῦρ' ἴθ', ὦ
σὰ κυναγ-
ὲ παρσένε.

V. 2. ὅρμαον reduplicavi. V. 3. Redde τοῖς κυρσανίαις—*juvenibus*. Intelligere nequeo τὼς κυρσανίους. V. 5. Inepte Brunck. e Ms. τᾶν τ' ἐμὰν μῶαν. Memoriæ dicuntur filiæ esse Musæ. V. 14. Pro ἐνίκων dedi ἐνικάσαμεν ob Scolion apud Athen. xv. p. 694. D. sic legendum Ἐνικάσαμεν, ὡς ἐβουλόμεσθ—α, νίκην ἔδοσαν θεοὶ φέροντ—ες παρὰ, Πανδρόσου λέ—ω φιλίαν, Ἀθανᾶν: ubi vulgatur ὡς φίλην: at per λέω Πανδρόσου intellige *plebem Atticam*, sic appellatam a Pandroso, filia Cecropis. V. 18. Vulgo θήγοντας οἷα: Brunckius οἷα temere rejecit. Ipse erui ὄσδω. Etenim apris est proprium dentes arbore exacuere. Vid. Æsopi Fab. clxxxv. Τὰς ἀγρίους ἐστὼς παρά τι δένδρον τοὺς ὀδόντας ἠκόνα. Neque hic est unicus locus, ubi ὄσδος corrumpitur. In Theocrit. Idyll. xix. 29. legitur Ὤδε καὶ ἁ χρυσέα Ἑλένα διεφαίνετ' ἐν ἁμὶν Πιείρα μεγάλα ἄτ' ἀνέδραμεν ὄγμος ἀρούρα. At Mss. ἀνέδραμε κόσμος. Tu lege Πιείρα τ' ἐλάτας ἄτ' ἀνέδραμεν ὄσδος ἀρούρα collato Idyll. xxiv. 101. νέην φύτον ὡς ἐν ἀλώᾳ Ἐτρέφετ': et Homerico ὁ δ' ἀνέδραμεν ἔρνεϊ ἴσος, et Euripideo in Hec. 20. Τροΐᾳ ὣς τις πτόρθος ηὐξόμην. Illa ἐλάτη est *pinus* arbor. V. 22. Vulgo πολύς δ' ἅμα καὶ κατὰ τῶν σκελῶν ἀφρὸς ἵετο. At ἵετο est e gl. ἦνσει, mox Ms. καὶ κατῶν. Sed aliud hìc aliquid legebat Hesychius, Ἀφρὸς κυρίως θάλλον καὶ ἀφρῶδες δὲ διαχώρημα ὡς Ἀριστοφάνης. Πολὺς δέμας κατὰ τήν. Ita Ms. teste Schowio. Emendat Kuster θαλάσσιον —— πολὺς δ' ἅμα κατὰ τοῖν [σκελοῖν]. At τοῖν metrum respuit, neque articulus adesse poterat propter locutionem similem apud Scholia pleniora in Rav. quam in Cod. Voss. sic Ἀφρός· πολὺς δ' [lege γὰρ] ἀφρὸς ἦν περὶ στόμα, [Cod. Voss. τὸ στόμα] καὶ [lege ὡς] Σοφοκλῆς. Αἰσχύλος δέ. Ἀφρὸς βροτείας [Voss. βορᾶς] ἐρύνκοτα στόμα. Lege Ἀφρὸς δὲ βροτόεις ἐρύη κατὰ στόμα: qui versus Æschyli fuit dictus de Oreste furibundo. Cf. Orest. 220. στόματος ἀφρώδη πέλανον. Quod ad βροτόεις, ea vox restituitur Æschyli Suppl. 892. in *Class. Journ.* No. vi. p. 417.: quod ad ἐρύη, cf. illa Xenophontea κατάπλεον αἵματος· ἐρύη γὰρ—ἐκ τῆς ῥινὸς et Ἐρύη ἐκ τοῦ σώματος αἷμα: quod ad κατὰ στόμα cf. Med.

1174. διὰ στόμα Χωροῦντα λευκὸν ἀφρόν : ubi Ald. κατὰ στόμα. V. 28. Vulgo μόλε δεῦρο παρσένε σιά, et in 36. δεῦρ' ἴθι δεῦρ' ὦ κυναγέ. Transposui σιά : cui, olim omissæ, additur παρσένε a librario, indicandi causa, quem in locum reponi debeat.

1279 et sqq.

πρόσαγε χόρον
ἄγε Χάριτας,
ἐπὶ δὲ κάλεσον Ἄρτεμιν,
ἐπὶ δὲ δίδυμον ἀγέχορον Ἰήϊον
ἐπὶ δ' εὔφρονα
Νύσιον, ὃς μετὰ Μαινάσιν
Βάκχιος ὄμμασι δαίεται
διὰ πυρὶ
φλεγόμενος,

ἐπί τε ποτνίαν
ἄλοχον ὀλβίαν,
εἶτα δὲ δαίμονας, οἷς ἐπιμάρτυσι χρηστόμεθ' οὐκ ἐπιλήσμοσιν
ἡσυχίας περὶ τᾶς ἀγανόφρονος, ἣν ἐποίησε θεὰ Κύπρις,
ὡς ἐπὶ νίκῃ εὐοὶ εὐοὶ εὐοὶ
ἀλαλαλαὶ ἰὴ παιηίων αἴρεσθ' ἄνωσὺ δὲ, Λάκων, πρόφαινε μοῦσαν ὀπὶ νέᾳ νέαν.

V. 2. Vulgo ἔπαγε. At sæpe sic usurpatur simplex post compositum. Cf. Bacch. 1054. Κάτηγεν ἤγεν. Alcest. 411. ὑπάκουσον ἄκουσον. Med. 1247. κατίδετ' ἴδετε. V. 14. Inepte vulgo ἡσυχίας —— μεγαλόφρονος. Dedi, quod ipse Comicus præcepit in Av. 1321. ἀγανόφρονος Ἡσυχίας : vid. et Ibyci fragmentum apud Athen. xiii. p. 564. Εὐρύαλε γλυκεί—ων Χαρίτων θάλος Καλλικόμων [τε κορ—ων] μελέϑημα, σέ γ' Ἄ Κύπρις ἀτ' ἀγανοβλέφαρος Πειθ—ὼ ῥοδέοισιν ἐν ἄνθεσι θρέψαν : sic enim ille locus scribi debet : confer quoque Cratini verba apud Lex. Bekker. p. 335. ἀγανόφρονες ἡδυλόγοι σοφίαι. Hanc conjecturam iratus video mihi præripuisse Reisigium in Conject. p. 165. V. 18. Pro ἐπὶ dedi ὀπί : vocem ipsam usurpat Homerus, et ὀπὸς Comicus in Thesm. 127.

1297 et sqq.

Ταὔγετον αὖτ' ἐρανὸν ἐκλιπᾶα,
μᾶα μόλ', ἰὼ, Λάκαινα, πρεπτὸν ἀμὶν
κλεᾶα τὸν Ἀμ-
ύκλαισι σὶον,
χαλκίοικον Ἀσάναν,
Τυνδαρίδας τ' ἀγασῶς,
τοὶ παρ' Εὐρώτ-
αν σιάδδον-
αι· μόλ', ἔμβας, ὦ,
εἶα κοῦφα πάλλ-
ω', ὡς Σπάρταν
ὑμνείωμες,
τᾷ σιῶν χόροι μέλ-
οντι καὶ ποδῶν κτύπ-
ος, ὅτε πῶλοι καὶ κῶραι
παρὰ τὸν Εὐρώταν ἀμπάλλ-
οντι πυκνὰν ποδοῖν ἀνκόνισιν
τάν τε κόμαν σείονθ' ὥστε Βακχᾶν
θυρσαδδομᾶν
καὶ παιδδομᾶν,
ἀγῆται δ'
ἁ Λατοῦς
ἀγνὰ χοραγ-
ὸς εὐπρεπής·
ἀλλ' ἄγετε κόμαν παραμπύ-
κιδδε χερὶ, ποδοῖν τε πάδη,
ᾇ τις ἔλαφος, πεδοῖ, κρότ-
ον δ' ἅμα πόη 'ν χορείᾳ
φυλέτᾳ, καὶ,
τῶν σιῶν τὰν
κράτισταν, χαλκίοικ-
ον ὕμνη πάμμαχον.

V. 8. Vulgo ψιάδδοντι: quod nemo intellexit. Dedi σιάδδονται, i. e. θειάζονται. Etenim Tyndaridæ post mortem sunt Diis adscripti. V. 9. Vice μάλ' ἔμβα reposui μόλ' ἔμβας. Etenim mentione facta Amyclarum, facete Comicus appellat, quasi personam, illud calcamenti genus, quod fieri solet Amyclis, teste Hesychio *Λακωνικὰ, ὑποδήματα, ἃ καλεῖται Ἀμυκλάδες.* V. 15. Vulgo ἅτε vel ἅτε. Redde ὅτε *quando.* V. 17. Exstat vel ἀγκονεύουσαι vel ἀγκονέουσαι. Dedi ἀν κόνισιν i. e. ἀνακόνισιν. Agnoscit H. Steph. *Ὑποκόνισις*, apud Theophrastum. Patet igitur et aliud compositum bene Græcum esse dictum. V. 18. Ita Koen. ad Gregor. p. 79. pro ταὶ δὲ κόμαι σείοντ'. V. 22. Ita Bergler. pro *Λήδας.* Non Ledæ sed Latonæ filia choros ducebat. V. 25. Vulgo ἄγε—παραμπύκλδός τε. Ipse τε transposui. V. 26. Vulgo ποδοῖν τε πάδδη πάδδη. Ms. et Junt. πάδη. Hoc probum: et ex altero effice πεδοῖ. Certe in tali re mentio terræ est usitata. Horatius; *nunc pede libero Pulsanda tellus,* ad Alcæi exemplar *νῦν χθόνα πρὸς βίαν παίην*: iterum Latinus, *Gaudet invisam pepulisse terram Ter pede fossor.* Aliis fortasse displicebit ποδοῖν τε. Ii legere poterunt *πόδικρα πάδη*: advocato Hesychio ποδίκρα, *ὄρχησις πρὸς πόδα γιγνομένη. Λάκωνες*, et collato Lys. 82. καὶ ποτὶ πυγὰν ἄλλομαι. V. 28. E χορωφελέταν, quod intelligi nequit, erui χορεία φυλέτα. Hesych. *Φυλέτης, ἐκ τῆς [αὐτῆς] φυλῆς ὅ ἐστιν ὁμόψυχος.* V. 32. ὕμνη pro ὕμνει; ut πόη pro πόει.

Etonæ, Dabam Kalend. Feb. A. S. MDCCCXVII.

COLLATIO
CODICIS HARLEIANI 5674.
CUM ODYSSEA EDITIONIS ERNESTINÆ 1760.

ΟΔΥΣΣ. Ρ.

9. *με ἴδηται* a manu prima.
11. *δέ τοι.*
18. *βίλτερον.*
22. *τόν.*
25. *ἡ κυκλικὴ ἐπποίη.* Deinde *ἐκαθεν δέ τε.*
26. *γε. δ' ἐκ μεγάροιο.*
29. *γε. ἔγχος μὲν τῆσιν περὶς κίονα μακρὴν ἐρείσας.*
37. *κἠ.*
49. omittit.
50. *γε. τηλέμαχ' ἑκατόμβας.*
52. *ἀγορὴν ἐσελεύσομαι* a m. prima. *δ'* ex emendatione additum in recens. In marg. *νῦν δὲ τὸν τόπον ἐκάλεσεν ἀγορήν: ἀριστοφάνης ἐλεύσομαι.*
55. *ἠώγεα* et suprascr. *ęę. ἠωγον.*

57. ἔνιοι ἴμμονος.

71. τοῖσι δὲ π.

80. δάσωνται.

87. ἐπὶ κλισμοῖσι κάθιζον. γρ. ἐϋξεστὰς λούσαντο.

93. παρὰ δὲ (sic.)

109. γρ. ἐς πύλον.

111. οὕτως ἀρίσταρχος· ὁ δὲ ζηνόδοτος ἐνδυκέως ἐφίλει· ὡσεί τε πατὴρ ἓὸν παῖδα:

119. μόγησαν γρ. δάμησαν.

127. νεηγενέας pro var. lect. et sic schol. Ven. ad Il. Λ. 115. qui mox ὁ δέ δ' ὦκα, quanquam dubium est, ad locum huncce an ad Od. Δ. 338. pertineat. Scholiastæ locus in codice Townleiano ita se habet: ὡς δ' ὁπποτ' ἐν ξυλόχοιι ἔλαφος κρατεροῖο λέοντος νεβροὺς κοιμήσασα ἕως ἐὴν εἰσήλυθεν εὐνήν.

129. ὁ δ' ἔπειτα et sic supra Δ. 338. sed ibi ex emend.

130. ἐφῆεί et suprascr. γρ. ἐφῆκεν.

131. omittit.

142. 153. ὄγ'.

146. κὲν et suprascr. καί.

147. ἀθετοῦνται ιστ στίχοι. [Voluisse videtur ιε.]

153. ἐμοῖο et μύθων.

156. ἰστίη.

159. ἐστίν. in marg. γρ. ἵστιν. [Fortasse ἰστίη adscriptum erat ad 156. ut significaret alibi hanc vocem cum leni occurrere. Deinde cum valde similes in MSS. quibusdam sint literæ ν et η, ἰστίη corruptum in ἰστίν.]

160. οἷον ἐγώ.

170. δειπνηστος et ῖ super η.

177. ποτ' οἶκον ἕκαστος. In marg. γρ. πείθοντό τε μύθῳ.

181. ε insertum in ἴερευον ab eadem manu. Versum ἀθετεῖ καὶ ἀριστοφάνης.

185. γρ. δ' ἴμεναι.

217. ἠγηλάζει text. sed in marg. ad 218. per errorem pro 217. hoc scholion adscriptum est: οὕτως ἀρίσταρχος καὶ ἀριστοφάνης χωρὶς τοῦ σ̄: Alii igitur quidam legebant ἠγηλάζεις. Quæ sane lectio, principum criticorum pace dixerim, mihi longe melior videtur. Alloquitur enim subulcum Melantheus, et singularem propositionem generali sententia comprobat.

218. ὡς prius explicatur ὄντως, posterius πρὸς.

221. πολλῆς primo scripsisse videtur, deinde ι addidisse. Et sane, cum ceteri omnes poëtæ φλιὰ spondeum faciant, malim πολλῆς. Mox φλίψεται a m. pr. θλίψεται ex emend. In margine, διὰ τοῦ θ̄ ὡς καὶ ζηνόδοτος: Alii Scholio θλίψεται præfigitur.

222. οὐκ ἄορά γ' in textu. In marg. γρ. οὐκ ἄορας οὐδὲ λίβητας. Schol. οὐδετέρως τὰ ἄορα ἵνα λέγῃ τὰ ξίφη. Sed ἄορας habet bis Apollonius, qui interpretatur γυναῖκας, Etymologus M. p. 56. 16. Hesychius, qui habet ἄορας· τὰ ξίφη ἀρσενικῶς. iterum Ἄορες· γυναῖκες λέγονται καὶ τρίποδες. Heliodorus Æthiopic. ii. p. 89.

223. λιπέσθαι et suprascr. γρ. γενέσθαι.

224. Schol. ad θαλλὸν κλάδον ἢ πᾶν τὸ ἐκ τῆς [γῆς.]

231. γρ. ἀμφικαρῇ.

232. πλευραὶ δ'.

237. ἀμφ' οὐδὶς, text. Schol. τὸ δὲ ἀμφ' οὐδὶς ὀξύνεται ὡς λικριφίς: Vide supra ad Λ. 596.

239. νείκεσ' ἐς ἄντα.

252. μεγάροις et ω super οις.

254. αὐτοῦ.

261. περὶ δὲ et in marg. ἀντὶ τοῦ περὶ γάρ σφεας.

262. ἀνὰ δέ σφισι et γὰρ supra δέ.

267. εὐερκέες ex emend. ejusdem manus.

269. γρ. πένονται.

270. ἐνήνοθεν a m. pr. ἀνίεχεται glossa. In marg. ἀρίσταρχος ἐνή-

νοθεν· αἱ δὲ κοιναὶ ἀνήνοθεν.

276. δῦσε δὲ [lege δῦσαι δὲ] et in marg. γρ. δύσαιο εἰσελθε [i. e. δύσεο.]

281. νοίοντι et α super ι.

288. σπλίζονται.

296. ἀποιχομένου ὀδυσῆος a m. pr. sed ου in οιο mutatum, et suprascr. γρ. ἄνακτος. Supra ἀπόθεστος scriptum, ἀπόθητος ἀνεπιμέλητος.

299. κοπρίσσοντες ex emend.

304. ἀπομόρξατο a m. pr. sed. ο in ε et ό in ά mutatum.

305. ἐρεείνατο μύθῳ. In marg. γρ. δ' ἐρέεινε, sed post ε aliquid erasum, fortasse το.

310. γρ. ἀγλαΐας et suprascr. καλλοσῦης. Deinde κοσμέουσιν, sed σ erasum.

314. μιν a m. pr. μοι post rasuram.

317. primo ὅττ' ἴδοιτο, deinde ὅττι δἰοιτο scripsit et glossam addidit διώξει.

331. ἔνθα δέ.

334. ἔνθα περ. Mox ἐφίζετο et suprascr. γρ. ἐφέζετο.

336. ἐδύσατο et suprascr. σσε.

343. ἄρτον τ'. Deinde ἐν κανέοισι, et suprascr. γρ. ἐκ κανέοιο.

344. κρέας. Postea ἀμφιβαλόντι γρ. ἀμφιβαλώντες.

347. παρεῖναι sine varietate.

349. πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευε sine v. l.

358. ἤσθιε δὲ ὡς et sic δὲ οὐ 373.

359. εὖθ' ὁ δεδειπνήκειν. ὀχ δ' ἐπαύετο (sic.) In marg. εὖθ' ὁ δεδειπνήκειν: οὕτω δεδειπνήκειν· ἀντὶ τοῦ δεδειπνήκειν. [l. κει.] ὡς τὸ ἤσκειν εἰρεια καλά:

379. καὶ προτιεόνδε καλέσας et suprascr. γρ. καὶ ποθι πόθεν. In marg. ἐγκλιτικὸν τό ποθι.

384. μάντιν γ' ἢ ἰητῆρα.

387. καλέει et οι super ει.

388. εἶς a m. pr. sed ς erasum.

389. δμωσὶ δ'.

393. ἄττα γρ. σίγα.

397. υἱος et suprascr. γρ. υἱοῦ.

400. οὗτοι, sed ῦ super ει.

401. init. μήτε τϊ.

405. ἀπαμείβετο φώνησέν τε.

409. τραπέζης.

413. γεύσασθαι.

418. ἐγὼ δὲ καί σε (καὶ additum ex recensione.)

427. στήσας δ' ἐν ex emend. Fuerat στῆσα δ' ἐν.

431. ἐπισπώμενοι.

435. οἶῃ.

441. ἄναγον.

442. γρ. ξείνω, quod non intelligo.

443. Vulgata est in Schol. marg. sed in textu δμηθέτορι ἰασιάδη. [Fortasse voluit δμήτηρ' ἰασίδη.]

448. ἵκηαι et suprascr. ἵδηαι.

449. ὅστις ex emend.

450. τρεῖς νοθεύονται.

455. οὕτως ἀριστάρχως· ὁ δὲ καλλίστρατος οὐδάλα τὰ κόπρια.

457. ἄπο προελών.

466. ἀψ ὀγ' ἐπ' οὐδόν text. In marg. γρ. ἀψ δ' ἄρ' ἐπ' οὐδόν.

472. βλήεται et σ additum super ή.

475. νοθεύονται στ.

496. ἐπαρῆισιν τέκος.

501. νοθεύει ἀρίσταρχος δ'.

506. ἐδείπνει.

507. προσέφη.

508. δὴ sine var. lect.

514. οἳ ὄγε γρ. ἦ ὄγε. In schol. marg. οἷα ὄγε.

519. ἀείδη et sic versu seq. Deinde γρ. ἐπιμερόεντα.

529. γρ. ἴν' ἀντίνοος.

533. τὰ μέν τ'.

534. ἠμετέρου πωλεύμενοι plane sine var. lect.

537. κατάνεται.

542. γρ. κανάχησε.

547. ἀλύξει.

556. αἱ δέ κε, sed εἰ super αἱ.

564. χαλεπὸν, et ὧν super όν.

565. ἦκεν.

567. ῥίξαντα et ζοντα supra ξαντα.

572. γάρ τοι, sed δὴ supra τοι.

586. ὥσπερ text., sed ὕσ supra ὥσ. Schol. etiam marg. ὥσπερ.

587. πώ τινες.

596. ἀχαιοί, sed ῶν super οί.

602. ἵζετ' ἐπὶ θρόνου ἔνθεν ἀνέστη. In marg. γρ. ἵζετ' ἐϋξέστου ἐπὶ δίφρου.

605. οἱ δ' a manu prima, τοὶ δ' ex emend.

ΟΔΥΣΣ. Σ.

3. Ἄζυγες φ. καὶ πίνεμεν.

4. εἶδος δὲ, sed μὲν supra δέ.

6. suprascr. ἐκ γενεῆς διχῶς.

14. τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος.

23. ὑποστρέψεσθαι, sed α super ε.

27. ἐν πολλοῖς γρηοῖ κεμενῶ.

28. σχεδὸν πᾶσαι χάμαι δὲ κε πάντας:

33. ἐτραχύνοντο ἠγριαίνοντο καὶ λίθον ἀκριόεντα τὸν τραχὺν καὶ οἷον ἄκρα ἔχοντα· καὶ ἀκριόεντα:

44. κέαται πυρὶ in marg. sed schol. habet ἐν.

51. τὸν δὲ, sed οἷς super ὸν.

56. βαρείη.

58. ἐπώμνυον et in marg. ἐπώμνυον. οὐκ ἀπώμνυον:—Deinde sequitur versus, αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' ὤμοσάν τε τελεύτησάν τε τὸν ὅρκον.

62. δειδιτ'.

64. ἀντίνοός τε καὶ εὐ. schol.

72. γρ. ἄξει.

77. ἐνένιπεν.

87. ἔλλαβε.

88. ἄναγον text. In marg. ἴωνες τὸ ἄγειν ἀνάγειν λέγουσιν· οἱ δ' ἔτι εἰς ἐλίκην τε καὶ αἰγιὸς δῶῳ ἀνάγουσιν: [Il. Θ. 203.]

90. ἐλάσει, sed σ supra σ et ει supra οι.

94. in marg. ἀνασχόμενοι· ἔστι δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀνασχομένων:

96. ἦλθε κατὰ στόμα.

97. ἡ αἰολὶς χανών:

104. σῦς τε κύνας τ'.

106. ἐπαύρῃ, , sed marg. γρ. ἄλλο πάθησθα.

109. ἆψ δ' ἂρ ἐπ'.

110. ἑ erasum, et καὶ non inclinatum.—Ibid. γελώωντες.

112. καί τοι.

114. 115. οὗτοι οἱ β· ἐκ τῶν ἄνωθεν μετήχθησαν.

116. δῖος.

122. ὄλβιος γρ. ὄλβος.

125. τοίου γὰρ καὶ πατρός.

133. τελέωσι m. pr.

140. τίς ποτε.

148. ἀναιμεωτί γε.

149. καὶ κεῖνον. In marg. κἀκεῖνον πλήρης ὁ κα: Deinde ὑπέλθη.

153. θυμῷ.

172. δάκρυσι, sed οι superadditum.

178. ἀλοιφῇ et suprascr. ἐλαίῳ.

183. οὐ κεῖσ' εἶμι text. In marg. τὸ πλῆρες ἐκεῖσε εἶμι· τινὲς δὲ εἶσιμι', ἄμεινον δὲ τὸ πρῶτον:

185. γρ. ἔσεσθαι.

191. προσώπατα καλά. Hesych. v. Κάλλος omittit τε. Apollonii vero MS. habet πρόσωπα τὰ teste Villoisono.

192. suprascript. ἀφροδίτη.

193. ἀνὴ ex emend.

196. ἀπεβήσατο et ε super α ultimam eadem m. additum. In marg. pro v. l. δῖ' ἀφροδίτη.

198. ἀνῆκε, sed suprascr. ἀφῆκεν.

220. τόγε, sed δ super γ.

222. δὴ insertum post πῶς. Deinde εἶτι text. et bis schol. marg.

228. χέρεια. Sed schol. ἠθέτει καὶ ἀριστοφάνης;

237. λελῦτο a manu prima, sed ν additum ex emend.

238. ἐπ' αὐλήισι. In marg. γρ. ἐν αὐλείῃσι. Pro νῦν MS. γοῦν.

240. ὀρθῶς et ος super ως.

244. κούρην (sic) et περίφρων suprascripto ον.

247. δαίνυτ' primo scriptum, sed accentus erasus, deinde alter supra υ positus, et α post ν additum.

252. σὺν τῷ ι ἀρίσταρχος καὶ ἀριστοφάνης ἀντὶ τοῦ ἦεν:

MISCELLANEA CLASSICA.

I. Mr. Mitford says that "our two sounds of TH, familiar to the Greeks at the farther corner of Europe, who express them by their Θ and δ, are unknown, and scarcely to be pronounced by any other European people." I have been informed by a native of Denmark, that the former is known to the Icelanders. (vol. i. p. 145.)

II. He endeavours to prove, from the situation of places, and the effects of the storm which attacked the fleet of Xerxes at the promontory of Sepias, that it was not the east wind, but the north-east. An additional argument may be drawn from the circumstance, that the Athenians imagined this tempest to be a fulfilment of their prayers to the north wind, which they had made by the direction of an oracle. (vol. ii. p. 143.)

III. "The Platæans, an inland people, unacquainted with naval affairs, but zealously attached to Athens, served with their best ability in the Athenian fleet." Thus, in Homer, an inland tribe embark for the Trojan expedition in ships given them by Agamemnon—*ἐπεὶ οὔ σφι θαλάσσια ἔργα μεμήλει.* (vol. ii. p. 157.)

IV. He thinks there is strong reason to suspect, that not Alcibiades, but his enemies, were the mutilators of the Mercuries; that they "committed the deed in secret, with the hope of fixing the suspicion upon him." We may add, that it might be also in their view to discourage the Sicilian expedition, by an unlucky omen. (vol. iv. p. 43.)

V. He has mentioned, as an instance of patriotism extended to the whole Greek nation, and not confined to a particular state, that Agis king of Lacedæmon would not take Elis when it was in his power. Perhaps this may rather be ascribed to his reverence for the sanctity of the place. Besides, his commission was only to chastise (*σωφρονίσαι*) the Eleans; which might be done by the conquest and ravage of their country alone, without attempting Elis. (vol. vi. p. 149.)

VI. Speaking of the reinforcement sent to the Lacedæmonian army after the defeat at Leuctra, he says, "The account, given by Diodorus, of the junction of the force under Archidamus with the retreating army, and of their separation afterwards for shame, is among the stories in his work beneath serious criticism." Yet he has himself related, that the army of Alcibiades, in the Asiatic war which followed the defeat of the Athenians at Syracuse, when joined at Sestos by the troops under Thrasyllus, who had been defeated at Ephesus, refused to associate with them, till a following victory, in which both had their share, wiped off the disgrace. He gives this on Xenophon's authority, without expressing any doubt. Diodorus is certainly not to be placed against Xenophon in the scale; but the fact does not seem very improbable, particularly since the Lacedæmonians were more tenacious of their military honor than the Athenians, or any other Greeks; and the fate of Pautites and Aristodemus in the Persian war, and the disgrace imposed upon the garrison of Sphacteria, who, after

a desperate resistance, had, not without authority from the Lacedæmonian commander in the neighbourhood, surrendered, may be adduced as specimens of the rigor to which this principle was carried in practice. (vol. vi. p. 212 : 4. p. 299, 300.)

VII. Speaking of Hermocrates the Syracusan, he says, " writers of all parties have borne testimony to his merit, and not one has imputed to him an evil action." Yet, in noticing the various accounts of the cause of the execution of Nicias and Demosthenes, he observes, " The party politics of after times led the Sicilian historian Timæus to calumniate Hermocrates." (vol. vii. p. 20: iv. p. 160.)

VIII. "At Athens, at *Corinth*, at Argos, every where in Proper Greece, the democratical party always desired to make the state a maritime power. The oligarchal party, on the contrary, and tyrants, unless the tyrant were a demagogue, endeavoured to withhold their people from maritime affairs." Without impeaching the general justice of this latter remark, or the truth of that concerning the long walls, it may be observed, that Corinth, in the most flourishing times of its naval power, was, for the most part, governed by an aristocracy. (vol. vii. p. 72.)

IX. " The Thracian monarchs drew from their lands a revenue of thirty talents yearly, and from their trade three hundred ; making together not less than six hundred thousand pounds sterling." Read rather sixty thousand. [1] (vol. vii. p. 368.)

X. " The king, Archidamus, being the principal mover, a plan was put forward, not unworthy of his character for wisdom, moderation, and liberality." He then proceeds to detail the particulars of the project. In opposition to this commendation, we may remark, that all the articles were calculated to serve the interest of Lacedæmon; which renders the excellence of the Lacedæmonian motives doubtful. Thebes, the enemy of Lacedæmon, was to resign the town and territory of Oropus, which were to be restored to Athens, its confederate : Orchomenus and Platæa, which had essentially assisted to keep the balance in Bœotia against Thebes, were to be delivered to their people who had been expelled by the Thebans: Tricenum was to be taken from the Argives, the old rivals of Lacedæmon, and restored to its faithful allies the Phliasians : "a part of Triphylia, apparently that conquered by the Arcadians," (at this time for the most part hostilely disposed to Lacedæmon) " was to return under the dominion of the Eleians, their confederates : the democratical government of Megalopolis, obnoxious to Sparta, was to be abolished : and Messenia was to be recovered." (vol. viii. p. 125, 126.)

XI. " As land was what a Thracian prince could perhaps of all things most cheaply give, he offered it in any quantity." This, and other similar offers, may remind us of the American grants of waste land to new citizens. (vol. v. p. 318.)

XII. Herodotus thus relates the stratagem by which Histiæus con-

[1] £74,250. at the highest calculation. Ed.

veyed to Aristagoras his injunction to excite a rebellion in Ionia: ὁ δὲ, τῶν δούλων τὸν πιστότατον ἀποξυρήσας τὴν κεφαλὴν, ἔστιξε, καὶ ἀνέμεινε ἀναφῦναι τὰς τρίχας· ὡς δὲ ἀνέφυσαν τάχιστα, ἀπέπεμπε ἐς Μίλητον, ἐντειλάμενος αὐτῷ ἄλλο μὲν οὐδέν· ἐπεὰν δὲ ἀπίκηται ἐς Μίλητον, κελεύειν Ἀρισταγόραν ξυρήσαντά μιν τὰς τρίχας, κατιδέσθαι ἐς τὴν κεφαλήν· τὰ δὲ στίγματα ἐσήμαινε, ὡς καὶ πρότερόν μοι εἴρηται, ἀπόστασιν. V. 35. The same method was used by a chief in alliance with Jenghiz-Khan, to convey a message to him in time of war.

XIII. He relates, in his account of Egypt, that the harbour of Naucratis was in old times the only one at which vessels were allowed to put in; and if any ship, by stress of weather, was forced to another port, it was obliged to sail from thence to the Canobian, or harbour of Naucratis. A similar regulation prevails at Japan. A shattered vessel, which was driven by circumstances to take refuge in one of the forbidden ports, was, in conformity to the letter of the law, drawn along the coast by means of ropes fastened to her from the shore, for some hundred miles, with great labour, till she arrived in the principal harbour, full of water, and no longer fit for service.

XIV. The contrivance of Tarquin the Proud, in Livy, to signify his opinion concerning the measures to be pursued by Sextus at Gabii, is related by Herodotus of Thrasybulus tyrant of Miletus, who gave similar counsel and in the same manner to Periander of Corinth; except that the poppies in Livy, (I. 54.) are ears of corn in Herodotus (V. 92.) The story perhaps passed as a family tradition to Tarquin, who was of the race of the Bacchiadæ, the principal objects of destruction and expulsion to Periander and his father Cypselus.

XV. Pericles, in Thucydides, expresses an apprehension that the Lacedæmonians may spare his lands; and, to clear himself of all suspicion in such case, he resigns them as public property. In the war of Gustavus Vasa with the Danes, the former studiously spared the estates of Archbishop Trolle, in order to render him suspected

XVI. Professor Monk, in his note on the 50th line of the Alcestis, where Apollo, addressing Θάνατος, tells him he has no great hopes of persuading him τοῖς μέλλουσι ΘΑΝΑΤΟΝ ἐμβαλεῖν, quotes several similar passages, suggested to him by Mr. Tate; and among others one from Milton. We may add an instance from Pope's Dunciad, Book IV., where speaking of *Dullness*, he says:

> O Muse! relate—for you can tell alone,
> Wits have short memories, and dunces none—
> Relate, who first, who last, her power confess'd:
> Whose heads she partly, whose completely blest:
> What charms could faction, what ambition lull,
> The venal quiet, and entrance the *dull*.—

And one from Campbell's Pleasures of Hope, Part II. where Hope is thus addressed:

> Inspiring thought of rapture yet to be,
> The tears of love were *hopeless*, but for thee!

XVII. There is a circumstance in the Iliad, displaying Homer's knowledge of human nature, which I have not seen commented on. When

Achilles has resolved to quit the service and return home to enjoy himself in peace, he finds plausible arguments in support of his resolution already made: Οὐ γαρ ἐμοὶ ψυχῆς ἀντάξιον, &c. and again, Λήϊστοι μὲν γάρ τε βόες, &c. But when on the occasion of the death of Patroclus, he determines to meet his predestined death, so as he may revenge himself on Hector, he recollects that all men are doomed to die—that Hercules himself could not escape, though favoured by Jupiter—that many Greeks, slain in battle, demand revenge from his hand—and similar arguments. This agrees with the well-known facility with which men find reasons, when they have formed their resolution.

XVIII. It appears to me that the word *ἀνθέω* may have originally been *ἀναθέω*, 'to run or shoot up;' and that *ἀνθὸς*, instead of being the original word, was the derivative. Ἀνατρέχω is used by Homer in the sense of growing as a plant:

——ὸ δ' ἀνέδραμεν ἔρνεϊ ἶσος. Il. Σ.

XIX. Mr. Mitford is inclined to think that Dionysius the elder was never entitled king of Syracuse or Sicily, and that he was only a prime minister and popular leader. To this idea I will venture to oppose a passage of Bentley, (Diss. on Phal. art. Phintienses) "I am entirely of Paruta's opinion, who interprets it of king Phintias. For is not Βασιλέως Φιντία in the genitive case, exactly like those other inscriptions—ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΙΕΡΩΝΥΜΟΥ, ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ?—Besides, the very word ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ shows, it belongs not to Gelo. For in his and his brother Hiero's coins the word is not used; Dionysius, as it seems, being the first Sicilian that styled himself Βασιλεὺς in his money." He refers to coins, or engravings of coins, of Dionysius, still in existence.

XX. The same historian is strong in his censures of the Theban constitution. Yet we have the testimony of Socrates to its merits, Plat. Crit. XV. ἐὰν εἰς τῶν ἐγγύτατά τινα πόλεων ἔλθῃς, ἢ Θήβαζε, ἢ Μεγάραδε, εὐνομοῦνται γὰρ ἀμφότεραι, κ. τ. λ. And the testimony of Plato, if we may consider him as sanctioning this opinion, is elsewhere extolled by Mitford. (vol. i. p. 445. chap. v. sect. 5.) "The character of Hipparchus has been transmitted to us, on no less authority than that of Plato, as one of the most perfect in history."

XXI. To the testimony above adduced in favor of the opinion that Thebes was a well-regulated state, I will add that of Sophocles, Œd. Col. 919. where, after having reproached Creon with a breach of law and justice, Theseus continues:

καί τοί σε Θῆβαί γ' οὐκ ἐπαίδευσαν κακόν.
οὐ γὰρ φιλοῦσιν ἄνδρας ἐκδίκους τρέφειν.
οὐδ' ἄν σ' ἐπαινέσειαν, εἰ πνθοίατο, κ. τ. λ.

The annexed γε adds a degree of point to the praise. "It was not Thebes that taught thee this injustice." And it may be observed, that this play was produced near the end of the Peloponnesian war, when the Thebans were animated with perhaps more hatred towards Athens than the Lacedæmonians themselves. (Xen. Hel. Lib. II. c. ii. 19.)

XXII. Mitford, vol. ii. chap. vi. 2. p. 30, note 12. "Thucydides and Plato, omitting all mention of the usurpation, speak of Darius as reigning next after Cambyses:" and refers to Thucyd. I. 14. ὀλίγον τε πρὸ τῶν Μηδικῶν καὶ τοῦ Δαρείου θανάτου, ὃς μετὰ Καμβύσην Περσῶν ἐβασίλευσε, τριήρεις περί τε Σικελίαν τοῖς τυράννοις ἐς πλῆθος ἐγένοντο, καὶ Κερκυραίοις. This is, however, no argument against the story of the usurpation. Thucydides, in giving, preparatory to his history, a brief account of a matter foreign to the Persian succession, the state of the Grecian military and marine in the times preceding his own, having occasion to specify the date of any particular fact by the reign of a Persian king, would naturally state his succession, without taking notice of an intermediate reign of seven months, and which was not acknowledged as legal: just as an English author, writing the history of the late wars of England with France, and prefacing it with a brief sketch of the progress of the British navy previous to the times in question, after having spoken of the times of Cromwell, as Thucydides in the preceding chapter speaks of those of Cambyses, might easily say: "In the reign of Charles II. who succeeded Cromwell, was gained the victory celebrated by Dryden in his Annus Mirabilis:" without taking the least notice of Richard Cromwell. Nor would a compiler of English history, living two thousand years later, be warranted in hazarding a suspicion, on such grounds, that Richard Cromwell is a mere εἴδωλον, conjured up by erroneous report and vague tradition.

XXIII. Mr. Mitford mentions as a proof that Agis of Sparta participated with his father and brother in that enlarged patriotism, extending to the whole Greek nation, which he ascribes to them, that "Xenophon has reported that Agis would not take Elis when in his power." Vol. VI. p. 149. Chap. xxvi. Sect. 6. In the passage referred to, Hel. Lib. 3. Cap. ii. 27. Xenophon mentions no motive for this forbearance of Agis; and it seems more likely, that he refrained from attacking Elis on account of its sanctity.

XXIV. Mr. Forsyth, in his work on Italy, speaking of two statues of Marsyas, says: "No Statue was more common at Rome than that of Marsyas; and he was so universally represented, as here, with his hands bending over his distorted brow, that Juvenal's image would be more obvious to a Roman, and more a picture, if read, 'Ceu Marsya vinctus.'"

XXV. The following are some instances of parallellisms, principally between ancient writers, but partly between ancient and modern.

1. Qualis vicino volucris jam sedula partu,
Jamque timens quâ fronde domum suspendat inanem,
Providet hinc ventos, hinc anxia cogitat angues,
Hinc homines: tandem dubiæ placet umbra, novisque
Vix stetit in ramis, ac protinus arbor amatur.

Stat. Achill. 2, 212.

Sic æstuat ales,
Quæ teneros humili fœtus commiserit orno,
Allatura cibos, et plurima cogitat absens,
Ne fragilem ventus discusserit arbore nidum,

Ne furtum pateant homini, neu præda colubris.
Claud. R. Pros. 3, 141.

2. Tanta enim ad singulos illius motus vis imbrium effusa, tanta ventorum violentia coorta est, ut divinitus hostem commoveri, non a cœlo, sed ab urbis ipsius mœnibus, et Capitolio videretur. Flor. Lib. 2, 6. (p. 183. ed. Var. 1674.)

Hanc urbem insano nullus qui Marte petivit
Lætatus violâsse redit: nec Numina sedem
Destituunt; jactata procul dicuntur in hostem
Fulmina, divinique volant pro mœnibus ignes,
Seu cœlum, seu Roma tonat. Claud. Bell. Get. 507.

3. De facie metuit, formæ confidit: et illum
Securum probitas, forma timere facit. Ov. Ep. Hel.

Elfrida.

Does Athelwold distrust Elfrida's virtue?

Athelwold.

No: but he much distrusts Elfrida's beauty. Mason's Elfrida.

4. Lymphaque muscosis exilit e laribus.
Dan. Heinsius, Monobibl. 3.

Lymphaque muscoso prosilit e lapide.
Poem by West, in Mason's Gray.

5. ῥεχθὲν δέ τε νήπιος ἔγνω. Hom. Il. P.

Hi pecudum ritu non impendentia cernunt——
acceptâ clade queruntur,
Et seri transacta gemunt. Claud. Eutrop. 2, 499.

6. ——Sullanum solito tibi lambere ferrum
Durat, Magne, sitis: nullus semel ore receptus
Pollutas patitur sanguis mansuescere fauces. Lucan. 1, 337.
Rufinus (neque enim patiuntur sæva quietem
Crimina, pollutæque negant arescere fauces)
Infandis iterum terras accendere bellis
Inchoat, et solito pacem vexare tumultu. Claud. Ruf. 2, 7.

7. Duc age, per Scythiæ populos, per inhospita Syrtis
Littora, per calidas Libyæ sitientis arenas.
Hæc manus, ut victum post terga relinqueret orbem,
Oceani tumidas remo compescuit undas;
Fregit et Arctoo spumantem vortice Rhenum.
Jussa sequi tam posse mihi, quam velle necesse est.
Lucan. 1, 367.

Te, quo libet ire, sequemur.
Te vel Hyperboreo damnatam sidere Thulen,
Te vel ad incensas Libyæ comitabor arenas.
Si calcare Notum, secretaque littora Nili
Nascentis jubeas, mundum post terga relinquam:
Et quocunque loco Stilicho tentoria figet,
Hîc patria est. Claud. Ruf. 2, 289.

This has been noticed before.

8. Pastor
Cujus herile pecus sylvis inopinus abegit

Imber, et hybernæ ventosa cacumina lunæ,
Questibus implet agros, stabulique silentia magni
Odit, et amissos longo ciet ordine tauros. Stat. Theb. 3, 49.
Pastor
Cui pecus aut rabies Pænorum inopina leonum,
Aut populatrices infestavere catervæ;
Serus at ille redit, desertaque pascua lustrans
Non responsuros ciet imploratque juvencos. Claud. Pros. 3.

9. ὅσσε δ' ἀμερδεν
Αὐγὴ χαλκείη. Hom. Il. N. 340.

perstringit aëna
Lux oculos. Claud. III. Cons. Hon.

πλεκτάνην κάπνου. Aristoph. Av. 1717.
Or do the *smoke-wreaths* daunt your eyes?
Scott, Rokeby, Canto 5.

11. Mr. Seager, in his parallel passages from authors ancient and modern, No. XVI. quotes the following passage from Diogenes Laertius, Vit. Aristipp. Τοὺς τῶν ἐγκυκλίων παιδευμάτων μετασχόντας, φιλοσοφίας δὲ ἀπολειφθέντας, ὁμοίους ἔλεγεν εἶναι τοῖς τῆς Πηνελόπης μνηστῆρσι. Καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνους Μελάνθω μὲν καὶ Πολυδώραν καὶ τὰς ἄλλας θεραπαίνας ἔχειν, πάσας δὲ μᾶλλον ἢ αὐτὴν τὴν δέσποιναν δύνασθαι γῆμαι. And he adds passages from Scriverius and Pope, containing a similar idea. I have found the same thought quoted from Plutarch, with a new application of it, in an anonymous work of one of our most popular poets. "In the mean time our modest Sceptic, in the absence of truth, contents himself with probabilities, resembling in this respect the suitors of Penelope, who, when they found that they could not possess the mistress herself, very wisely resolved to put up with her maids; τῇ Πηνελόπῃ πλησιάζειν οὐ δυναμένοι, ταῖς ταύτης ἐμίγνυντο θεραπαίναις. Plutarch. περὶ παίδων ἀγωγῆς." The Sceptic, a Philosophical Satire, p. 19, 1809.

12. δμωΐδες δὲ
καινοπήμονες νέαι— Æsch. Theb. 357. Blomf.
"Sophocli καινοπαθής. Trach. penult."
Blomf. Gloss. 358, in v. καινοπήμων.

To this may be added Hom. Od. A. Παρθενικαί θ' ἁπάλαι, νεοπένθεα θυμὸν ἔχουσαι.

13. Μόνοι γὰρ ἔχουσί τε ἅμα καὶ ἐλπίζουσιν, ἃ ἂν ἐπινοήσωσι.
Thucyd. 1, 70.

Blest madman! who could ev'ry hour employ
With something new to hope, or to enjoy!
Dryden's Absalom and Achitophel.

14. ——φίλους γε, κἄτι μᾶλλον ἢ φίλους. Eurip. Hipp. 918.
The father, friend, and now the more than friend!
Lord Byron, Childe Harold, Canto 2, ad fin.

15. ὦ πλεῖστον Ἑλλὰς, πένθος οἷον εἰσορᾷ
ἔξουσαν, ἀνδρὸς τοῦδέ γ' εἰ σφαλήσεται. Soph. Trach. 1114.
Hei mihi! quantum
Præsidium, Ausonia, et quantum tu perdis, Iule! Virg. Æn. 11.

16. αὕτη γὰρ ἡ γῆ ξύμμαχος κείνοις πέλει. Æsch. Pers. de Græcis.
ἐξεύρηται δέ σφι ταῦτα, τῆς τε γῆς εὐούσης ἐπιτηδέης, καὶ τῶν ποταμῶν ἐόντων σφι συμμάχων. Herod. Lib. 4, 47. de Scythis.
——δείματός σε μὲν ἐπιπλέος—ὀρέων τοι δύο τὰ μέγιστα πάντων ἐόντα πολεμιώτατα—τὰ δὲ δύο ταῦτα, ἔστι γῆ τε καὶ θάλασσα.
Lib. 7, 49. (Artabanus ad Xerx.)
τοῦ τε γὰρ χωρίου τὸ δυσέμβατον ἡμέτερον νομίζω, ὃ μενόντων ἡμῶν ξύμμαχον γενήσεται, ὑποχωρήσασι δὲ, καίπερ χαλεπὸν ὄν, εὔπορον ἔσται, μηδενὸς κωλύοντος.
Thucyd. Lib. 4, 10. (Demosthenes ad milites in Pylo.)

17. ἀλλ' ἡ φρόνησις ἡ 'γαθὴ, θεὸς μέγας.
Incert. ap. Stob. citante Brunck. ad Soph. Philoct. 782.
Nullum numen abest, si sit prudentia. Juv. Sat. 10. penult.

18. ὦ Θάνατε, Θάνατε, πῶς ἀεὶ καλούμενος
οὕτω κατ' ἦμαρ, οὐ δύνῃ μολεῖν πότε; Soph. Philoct. 797.
And over them triumphant death his dart
Shook, but delay'd to strike, though oft invok'd.
Milt. Par. L. 11.

19. Ὅς καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τεκτήνατο νῆας ἔΐσας,
Ἀρχεκακοὺς, αἳ πᾶσι κακὸν Δαναοῖσι γένοντο. Hom. Il. E. 62.
Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν δὴ ἀναπεισθέντες, ἐψηφίσαντο εἴκοσι νέας ἀποστεῖλαι βοηθοὺς Ἴωσι—αὗται δὲ αἱ νέες, ἀρχὴ κακῶν ἐγένοντο Ἕλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάροισι. Herod. Lib. 5, 97.

20. τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς χρὴ ἀσφαλεστέραν μὲν εὔχεσθαι, ἀτολμοτέραν δὲ μηδὲν ἀξιοῦν τὴν ἐς τοὺς πολεμίους διάνοιαν ἔχειν.
Thuc. Lib. 2, 43.
Disce, puer, virtutem ex me verumque laborem;
Fortunam ex aliis. Virg. Æn. 12.
Digna minus misero, non meliore viro. Ov. Ep.

21. ἀνδρῶν γὰρ ἐπιφανῶν πᾶσα γῆ τάφος. Thuc. ib.
In vain their bones unburied lie—
All earth becomes their monument!

22. Ite truces animæ, *funestaque Tartara leto*
Polluite. Stat. Theb. 11.
Tollite de mediis animarum dedecus umbris,
Et Ditis purgate domos. Claud. Ruf. 2, ad fin.

23. Οὐ γὰρ ἐν σκότῳ ὑμᾶς οἱ θεοὶ ἀποκρύπτονται, ἀλλ' ἐμφανῆ πᾶσιν ἀνάγκη ἀεὶ ζῆν τὰ ὑμέτερα ἔργα.
Xen. Cyrop. VIII. (Cyrus moriens ad filios.)

Eorum fortia facta memorando clariores esse (nobilitas Rom.) putant; quod contra. Nam quanto vita illorum præclarior, tanto secordia horum flagitiosior. Et profectò ita se res habet; majorum gloria posteris lumen est, neque bona neque mala facta in occulto patitur. Sallust. Jug. 86. (Marius ad milites.)

Nam si quis ab incunte ætate habet causam celebritatis et nominis, aut a patre acceptam (quod tibi, mî Cicero, arbitror contigisse,) aut aliquo casu atque fortunâ; in hunc oculi omnium conjiciuntur, atque in eum, quid agat, quem ad modum vivat, inquiritur: et tanquam in

clarissimâ luce versetur, ita nullum obscurum potest nec dictum ejus esse, nec factum. Cic. Off. 2, 13.

Omne animi vitium tanto conspectius in se
Crimen habet, quanto major, qui peccat, habetur.
. . . . . .
Incipit ipsorum contra te stare parentum
Nobilitas, claramque facem præferre pudendis.

Juv. Sat. 8.

——cognoscas cunctis tua gentibus esse
Facta palam ; nec posse dari regalibus unquam
Secretum vitiis: nam lux altissima fati
Occultum sinit esse nihil, latebrasque per omnes
Intrat, et abstrusos explorat Fama recessus.

Claud. VI. Cons. Hon.

ON THE

ORIGINALITY OF KUSTER'S DISCOVERY,

ABOUT THE TRUE FORCE OF THE MIDDLE VERB.

Lennep (*de Analogia L. Gr. p.* 104-10.) is mistaken in supposing that all the Grammarians and Critics, prior to the time of Kuster, "in eo tantum consistere Medii Verbi vim putasse, ut alia tempora active, alia passive caperentur, imo eadem tempora, modo active, modo passive significarent;" cum tandem aliquando "Kusterus aliam plane viam ingressus sit, et, multis veterum locis in medium allatis, ostendat, hujus verbi medii vim non solum consistere in simplici, vel activa, vel passiva significatione, sed in virtute quadam, quæ inter utrumque media esset, sive, quæ simul active, simul passive, esset intelligenda, adeoque, quæ reciprocam efficeret significationem, per quam, nimirum, ipsi a nobis aliquid pati intelligimur, vel etiam ab altero, nostro jussu et voluntate." For Hieronymus Wolfius had, long previously to the appearance of Kuster's book, as Chr. Wolle has shown, noticed the genuine import of the middle verb; and as many scholars of the present day have fallen into the same mistake of attributing to Kuster the sole merit of this discovery, I feel myself called upon, partly with a view to prevent such misconception for the future, and partly in justice to the memory of Hieronymus Wolfius, to produce the passage, to which I allude:—

"Neque vero plane nova sunt, quæ de hoc verborum mediorum

usu tradidit Academiæ Paris. adscriptus. Hieron. Wolfius jam olim in suis eruditis in Libanii argumentum Orationis Olynth. 1. Demosth. Annotatt., hæc commentatus est:—'Differunt tamen (non semper, sed aliquando,) sic ab Activis Media, ut illa eum, qui ipse facit aliquid, hæc eum, qui faciendum curat, significent, ut, 'Η βουλὴ ἐποιήσατο τὰς τριήρεις, Senatus curavit faciendas triremes, 'Ο τέκτων ἐποίησε, Faber fecit. 'Ο καταψευδομαρτυρήσας, Qui falso testimonio oppressit: 'Ο καταψευδομαρτυρησάμενος, Qui falsos testes subornavit. *Καταδικάσαι* judicis, *Καταδικάσασθαι* accusatoris est. Germani pro *ποιήσασθαι*, *Machen lassen*, interdum simpliciter *Machen*, *καταχρηστικῶς* dicunt, curatori id tribuentes, quod fit ab artifice.' Vid. Demosthenis recogniti Specimen, Basileæ ex officina Hervag. A. p. C. N. CIↃIↃLXIX. ab hoc doctissimo curatum homine, quod mihi hæc scribenti ad manus est, p. 326." Chr. Wollius de Verb. Gr. Med. pp. 314=xcvi.

As Lennep errs in attributing to Kuster the sole merit of the discovery about the genuine Attic import of the middle verb, so Fischer (*Animadvv. ad Velleri Gram. Gr.*) is mistaken in supposing that it had escaped the notice of the ancient grammarians. "Hanc verborum mediorum vim," says Fischer, "eorumque a verbis passivis differentiam, non satis cognitam fuisse multis, intelligi potest ex iis, quæ ap. Macrobium de Diff. Verbi Gr. et Lat. p. 695. et ap. Eustath. ad Il. α′ p. 191, 41. ad Odyss. γ′ p. 1461, 49. leguntur: putarunt enim ea verba, quæ in *μαι* desinerent, hacque una eademque forma et actum et passionem designarent, esse *μέσα*, vel, ut Eustathius loquitur, *μέσως ἔχειν*, unde Macrobius ea nominavit *communia*."

But let us hear what Bowyer says in the preface to his Edition of Kuster's Tract:—

"An Kusterus reflexivam verborum mediorum significationem primus deprehenderit, ignoro: eam certe pluribus, quam quisquam alius, argumentis in isto libello stabilivit. Alii in verbis quibusdam eam notarant; an vero ceteris sit communis, altum agunt silentium. Eustath. ad Il. N. 168. (p. 926, 21.): *Διαφορὰν δὲ τοῦ*[1] *Οἴσων καὶ Οἰσόμενός φασιν οἱ παλαιοὶ, ὅτι τὸ μὲν οἴσων ἀπ' ἄλλου εἰς ἄλλον κινεῖ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ χρησίμου· τὸ δὲ οἰσόμενος ἐνὶ προσώπῳ ἐμπεριγράφει*[2] *αὐτήν· οἷον, Ἄπεισί τις δόρυ οἰσόμενος ἑαυτῷ, οἴσων δὲ ἑτέρῳ τινί.* Id est, inter *οἴσων* et *οἰσόμενος* differentiam esse

---

[1] In the Edition of Kuster's book, published in 1806, the only one now at hand, (see the new *Greek Thesaurus*, p. cviii.) the passage is thus inaccurately printed: Διαφορὰν δὲ οἴσων καὶ οἰσόμινός φασιν οἱ παλαιοί. As one instance of the occasional inaccuracy of the Index to the Roman Edition of Eustathius I will mention that under *Οἴσων* instead of 926, 22. we have 966, 22.

[2] "Ἐμπεριγράφω exponitur Scripto comprehendo," H. Steph. Thes. Ind. He cites no authority for the word, but it is used not only by Eustathius in this passage, but also by J. Pollux ix. 108. and Sextus Emp. Pyrrh. i. 266.

tradunt veteres, nempe οἴσων ab alio in alium transfert effectum commodi alicujus, οἰσόμενος vero intra unam personam eum cohibet, ut, Abit aliquis hastam relaturus sibi, οἰσόμενος: alteri vero, οἴσων." Scholia Pseudo-Didymi ad Il. N. 168.: *Οἱ. Κομίσων, οἴσων. Διαφέρει δὲ τὸ οἴσων καὶ τὸ οἰσόμενος. Οἴσων μὲν γὰρ, ἑτέρῳ. Οἴσε θέειον, γρηῢ, κακῶν ἄκος. Οἴσετε δ' ἄρνα λευκόν. Οἰσόμενος δὲ, ἑαυτῷ.*

In the passage of Eustathius, the reader cannot fail to observe that he is not delivering the particular opinion of himself, or of any contemporary critic, but says expressly that the ancient critics in general had noticed the difference between the active and the middle voice in the words οἴσων and οἰσόμενος.

It is a matter of much surprise to me that Kuster has not once, throughout his Tract, referred to the opinions of Eustathius and the writer of the Etymologicum Magnum upon the subject of the Middle Verb; and yet it is scarcely possible to suppose him to have been a stranger not merely to the passage just adduced, but to all the passages, which Fischer has, in the Notes on Weller's Grammar, produced from Eustath. and the Etym. M.; and also to the observations of Hieronymus Wolfius, who had, as we have seen, before the time of Kuster, pointed out the true force of the Middle Verb. Shall we then infer that Kuster has stolen either from Eustathius, or from Hieron. Wolfius, what has been improperly termed his discovery? This I should be sorry to think and to say of so great a scholar, though I can scarcely avoid coming to this conclusion. In the Præfatio ad Lectorem, Kuster writes thus warily :—

"Per posterioris generis verba media intelligo ea, quibus constans usus attribuit significationem, quam activæ eorundem verborum formæ minime inesse, *omnibus notum sit*, vel saltem, *si id antea observatum non fuit*, a quovis, qui animum attendere voluerit, observari possit."

At the beginning of the first section, he writes with equal caution :—

"*Verba media ap. Græcos sic appellata sunt*, non tam quod terminationem partim activam, partim passivam habeant, neque quod interdum active, et interdum passive significent, *quæ est communis Grammaticorum opinio, vel potius error*, sed quod actionem cum passione mixtam denotent, et sic inter verba activa et passiva revera medie se habeant, et utrique formæ ita affinia sunt, ut tamen ab utraque discrepent."

From these words it does not appear whether Kuster thought that the Middle Verb was so called by the ancient Grammarians

---

referred to by Schneider in his Lexicon. For Pyrrh. i. 206. in the Index of Fabricius, by a blunder of the press, we have Pyrrh. i. 266.

themselves, or only by modern Grammarians. In another passage, which occurs in the same Preface, he does not hesitate to speak of himself as the discoverer of the true principle of the Middle Verb :—

" Si igitur veram differentiæ hujus rationem, *in quibusdam verbis obscure tantum et confuse antea cognitam, in plerisque vero penitus ignoratam*, exposui, et ex tenebris quasi in lucem protraxi, operæ pretium me fecisse existimabo. Hac autem de re penes candidum, neque livore corruptum Lectorem judicium esto. Eos vero, qui animo carpendi potius, quam discendi, mea lecturi sunt, rogatos velim, ut certa ab incertis et dubiis separent, neve, si forte paucis in locis *novæ inventionis* amori me plus æquo indulsisse senserint, in ceteris quoque idem mihi accidisse, vel sibi, vel aliis nimis temere persuadeant."

But whatever opinion the reader may form upon the originality of Kuster's discovery, one thing at least is beyond doubt ; " eum certe pluribus, quam quisquam alius, argumentis in isto libello stabilivisse." See Bowyer's Preface cited above.

Perhaps the reader will agree with me in thinking that the truly learned scholar and divine, Dr. S. Clarke, cannot altogether be acquitted of the charge, which has been brought against him, of having profited by Kuster's book, in his erudite remarks on Homer, without making any mention of Kuster's name. The first edition of Kuster's book appeared in 1714, the second in 1717 ; but Dr. Clarke published the first part of his Homer in 1729. C. Wolle supposes that Dr. Clarke had benefited from Kuster's conversation during his residence in England ; but it is sufficient for our purpose to know that the first edition of Kuster's book preceded that of Clarke's Homer by 15 years, and that even Kuster's second edition appeared 12 years before the Homer. Wolle's words are these :—

" Hic illustris Magnæ Britanniæ Theologus, cum variis sacris, quas sevit, litibus et controversiis, tum vero etiam interiori Græci sermonis cognitione, celebre sibi nomen peperit. Is, ut conjicio, Kusteri fontibus suos irrigavit hortulos, quippe qui diu in hac cultissima vixit [vixerit] insula ; nec vero Kusteri liber ipsum fugere potuit." Wollii Præf. nov.

Even the candid Bowyer was obliged to confess his surprise that Dr. Clarke has omitted the name of Kuster, in speaking of the celebrated 20th line of the first book of the Iliad. Bowyer's words are these :—

" Quendam etiam in Act. Erudit. Lips. Feb. 1712. citat Clarkius ad Il. α', 20. qui ex discrimine inter λύω et λύομαι veram lectionem loco reddiderit ; unde autem ortum id discriminis, quibus fundamentis nixum se primum ostendisse gloriatur Kusterus, et quantulascunque partes sustinet, mirum est Clarkium ei tribuisse

nullas, præsertim cum hæc observatio de primigeniæ vocis mediæ usu inter notas ad Homerum utramque faciat paginam. ‘Quare λύσασθαι,’ ut ait Kust. de V. M. § 2. 11. (cujus libri editio prima prodiit a. 1714., altera 1717., Clarkius vero edidit primam partem Homeri 1729.) ‘in medio, *captivum redimere*, nondum ab ullo Grammaticorum video esse expositum.’”

I am inclined to suspect, not that Dr. Clarke intended to commit any act of literary piracy, but that he was induced to suppress Kuster's name in consequence of some unpleasant circumstances, which had occurred between them during Kuster's residence in England.

It may be worth while here to observe that Lennep, in the passage cited above, somewhat underrates the value of Wolle's lucubrations, which even I. F. Fischer has not properly estimated, when he writes l. c.—“In Dissertatione sua unice hoc egit Wollius, ut doceret, verba media esse, et qua significationem, et qua declinationem, a verbis activis et passivis diversa, h. e. reciproca, et retransitiva.” Fischer, in the preface to Dresigius's book, published by him three years subsequently to the appearance of the 2d edition of Wolle's book, entirely suppresses the mention of Wolle's name and his book, and contents himself with saying:—“Quum a Kustero universe de isto Verborum genere eleganter disputatum esset, constituit Dresigius, singulatim verba media N. T. explicare. Neque sane est negandum, eorum naturam et vim ita explicatam ab eo et demonstratam esse, ut nullus alius liber, quod sciam, reperiatur, ubi tam copiose et accurate de iis sit expositum.”

On a future occasion I shall make some remarks on the origin of the term *Middle*, as applied to the Greek Verb, and shall show the mistakes, into which H. Stephens, Kuster, Wolle, and Fischer have been betrayed. All those, who are sufficiently aware of the importance of pointing out the errors and misconceptions of scholars, whose works are so universally read, will easily pardon me for the pains which I shall take to put the student upon his guard against the adoption of those errors and misconceptions, and be inclined to accept from me the same apology, which De La Cerda, when writing about the herb Melissophyllon (Virg. Georg. iv. 63.), offers to his readers: *Volui hoc attingere; nam hic error in gymnasiis volitat cum incommodo juventutis.*

E. H. BARKER.

Thetford, May, 1817.

P. S. In a letter, addressed by Petr. Olaus Bröndstedt to Olaus Wormius, and inserted in the *Epistolæ Parisienses, in quibus de Rebus variis, quæ ad Studium Antiquitatis pertinent, agitur*, edited by G. G. Bredow, Lips. 1812. p. 139., among numerous and excellent corrections of the *Scholia in Platonem*, I find some

emendations of the passage respecting the *Lotus tree*, mentioned by me in another article. Bröndstedt rightly inserts τὴν before *Μέμφιν*, and rightly substitutes ἔλαττον for ἐλάττων. The latter conjecture, which I have myself made l. c. is confirmed by the passage quoted by me from Theophrastus, whose words the Scholiast is citing. For the words, Ὁ δὲ καρπὸς ὥσπερ κύαμος πεπαίνεται, ὥσπερ βότρυες, μεταβάλλων τὰς χρόας, Bröndstedt proposes to substitute, Ὁ δὲ καρπὸς ὥσπερ κύαμος, πεπαίνεται δὲ ὥσπερ οἱ βότρυες, μεταβάλλων τὰς χρόας. Now, as these are the very words of Theophrastus, of whom, however, Bröndstedt makes no mention, what are we to think? that Bröndstedt corrected the Scholiast from Theophrastus, but purposely suppressed the mention of his name, lest it should detract from the merit of the conjecture? This I should be most unwilling to believe of so excellent a scholar. Lastly, for the words, Καὶ παρὰ τὴν Λωτοφαγίαν νῆσον, ἀνέχουσαν τῆς χώρας, he would read, Καὶ παρὰ τὴν Λωτοφαγίδα νῆσον ἀπέχουσαν κ. τ. λ. Surely for *Λωτοφαγίδα* he either wrote, or meant to write *Λωτοφαγίτιδα*, (as in Strabo p. 834., Συνεχὴς δ' ἐστὶν ἡ μικρὰ Σύρτις, ἣν καὶ Λωτοφαγῖτιν Σύρτιν λέγουσι.) I have l. c. observed that this island is by Theophrastus called *Λωτοφαγία*, and that the accuracy of that reading, which Bodæus seems inclined to dispute, is placed beyond doubt by its being found in the Scholiast also. As to the other emendation ἀπέχουσαν, there can be no doubt of its correctness, as it is supported both by the obvious sense of the passage and by the received text of Theophrastus. Thus it appears that all the conjectures proposed by Bröndstedt with one exception correspond to the very words of Theophrastus, and if he be acquitted of the charge of plagiarism by some, this curious coincidence must still seem so unaccountable to others, as to excite some suspicion of guilt.

E. H. B.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS

On the Extracts from Arcadius Grammaticus MS.

"I should be much more disposed to believe that the *Κομμώτριαι* derived their name from *Κομμώ*, i. e. the priestess employed to sweep the floor of Minerva's temple. *Λέξεις ῥητορικαὶ* in Bekkeri Anecd. Gr. T. i. p. 273.: *Κομμώ· ἡ κοσμοῦσα τὸ ἕδος τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἱέρεια.*" Extracts from Arcadius in *Class. Journ.* xxix. p. 170.

This priestess is called *Κοσμὼ* by Harpocratio v. *Τραπεζοφόρος*: *Λυκοῦργος ἐν τῷ Περὶ τῆς Ἱερείας· ὅτι ἱερείας ὄνομά ἐστιν ἡ Τραπεζοφόρος· ὅτι αὐτή τε καὶ ἡ Κοσμὼ * συνδιέπουσι [1] πάντα τὰ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερά, αὐτός τε ὁ ῥήτωρ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ δεδήλωκε, καὶ Ἴστρος ἐν ἕκτῃ καὶ δεκάτῃ τῶν Ἀττικῶν Συναγωγῶν.*

* *ΚΡΑΤΑΠΑΛΛΟΣ*, *εἶδος νομίσματος.* In *Class. Journ.* xxix. p. 166. I have noticed this as a word not to be found either in the Thesaurus of H. Stephens, or in the Lexicon of Schneider. But it is to be found in both those works under a different form, and with a different accent, *Κραπάταλλος*. See Hesych. (ubi pro vulgato *κραπάταλλος*, in Cod. Ven., teste Schowio, legitur *κραπάταλλον*,) J. Poll. vii. 152. ix. 83. Athen. iii. 75. et alibi.

* *ΤΡΙΒΗΝ, ὁ τρίπους.* This word I have also noticed l. c. p. 167. as one which is not acknowledged by either H. Stephens, or Schneider. It certainly is not to be found in its place in either lexicographer. But under *Τιβὴν* H. Stephens has the following words:—"*Τιβὴν*, Tripus, dictus *τιβὴν* quasi *τριβὴν*, quoniam *ἐπάνω τριῶν βάσεων κεῖται*, ut Etym. tradit, [p. 758, 7. *Τιβὴν τιβῆνος, λέγεται ὁ τρίπους, τριβήν τις ὤν, ἀποβολῇ τοῦ ρ, παρὰ τὸ ἐπάνω τριῶν βάσεων κεῖσθαι.*] Affertur autem ex Lycophrone." Zonaras p. 1730.: *Τιβὴν, τιβῆνος, τοῦ τρίποδος.* "*Τιβὴν, ῆνος, ὁ*, bey Lycophr. 1104. *Τιβῆναι* [*Τιβῆνα*] *καὶ κύπελλον* [*ἐγκάρσ*] *ῥανεῖ*, wo man es *τρίποδα* erklärt, und von *τρὶς, βάω, βαίνω* ableitet. Hesych. hat *Τίβηνος· λέβης, τρίπους.* S. *Ἴβηνος.*" Schneideri Lex. Tzetzes: [2] *Τιβῆνα δὲ τὸν τρίποδα.* Eustath. ad Odyss. Θ. p. 1605, 2.:—*Ὁ δὲ τρίπους καὶ τιβὴν, παρά τε Λυκόφρονι καὶ ἄλλοις λέγεται, ὡς οἱονεὶ τριβὴν ὅ ἐστι τρεῖς βάσεις ἔχων.* Müller ad Lycophr. is silent about the passage of Eustathius. It should seem that Arcadius in his copy of Lycophron's poem, found *τριβὴν*, and so Lycophron wrote, as I think; for I know no dialect which he could have used, according to the

---

[1] Voces asterisco notatæ in H. Steph. Lex. non leguntur. Verbum hocce et in Schneideri Lexico desideratur.

[2] Tzetzes ibi habet, *Κόγχον δὲ, ὁπτῶν τοῦ ἰγνιφάλου * κογχυλιάς.* In Schneideri Lex. vox *κογχυλιάς* affertur, sed *ἁμαρτύρως.*

principles of which he would have been justified in substituting τιβὸν for τριβύγ. In the Gloss. of Hesychius quoted by Schneider, *Τίβηνος· λέβης, τρίπους*, read with Heinsius and Bruno, *Τιβήν, τιβῆνος*.

Barkero Boissonade[1] S.

"Recepto Ephemeridis Classicæ fasciculo xxix. et inspecto indice, statim quæsivi Excerpta Arcadiana, ut discerem a te, viro

---

[1] ῬΑΧΙΑ. The excellent author of the *Curæ posteriores* in Class. Journ. xxviii. p. 358. says: "to the numerous authorities on the word ῥαχία collected by the learned Mr. Barker, the reader can add the note of Dr. Coray ad Heliodor. i. c. i. p. 3." The reader may, if he pleases, also add a very important passage from Nonni Synag. Ἱστορ. p. 145. ed. R. Montagu.: *Κατὰ τὸ Σικελικὸν καὶ Τυῤῥηνικὸν πέλαγός ἐστι τις τόπος, ἐν ᾧ ἡ θάλασσα γίνεται ἀμπωτὶς καὶ ῥαχία· καὶ διίσταται τὸ ὕδωρ, ὥστε τὸν πυθμένα τῆς θαλάσσης κατὰ τοῦτο τὸ μέρος, ἐγγὺς ὄντα, ὁρᾶσθαι. Ἀμπωτὶς δέ ἐστιν, οἷον ἀνάπωσίς τις καὶ * ἀναῤῥόφησις· τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ ὑποναστεῖλεν ἐν τισι κοιλώμασι τῶν πετρῶν, καὶ πάλιν ἐκρύγνυται, ὃ καὶ καλεῖται ῥαχία. Ἦν δὲ οὗτος ὁ τόπος τοῖς πλέουσιν ἐπικίνδυνος καὶ θανάτου μαστός. * Ὁλοβρύχιον γὰρ τὸ πλοῖον ἐγίνετο ἐν τούτῳ τῷ τόπῳ, εἰ συνέβη, πλέοντος τοῦ πλοίου, γενέσθαι ἀμπώτιδα καὶ ῥαχίαν.* Idem ibid. p. 163.: *Ἀμπωτὶς, ὡς ἤδη ἡμῖν εἴρηται, ἐναντία ἐστὶ τῇ ῥαχίᾳ. Ταῦτα δὲ πάθη ἐστὶ θαλάσσης στενῆς περιπελαμένης ἢ ὑπὸ νήσων, ἢ ὑπὸ γωνίαν. Ἀμπωτὶς δέ ἐστιν οἱονεὶ ἀνάπωτις καὶ * ἀναῤῥόφη ὑποστελλομένου τοῦ ὕδατος εἰς μυχούς τινας τῆς ὑπακειμένης γῆς, καὶ μετ' ὀλίγον πάλιν ἐκρωννύντος. Τὸ μὲν οὖν ὑποστελλόμενον τὸ ὕδωρ ἴσως εἰς τὰ κοῖλα τῆς γῆς, λέγεται ἀμπωτὶς· τὸ δὲ πάλιν ἐκρῶσαν αὐτὸ, καλεῖται ῥαχία. Γίνεται δὲ τοῦτο πολλάκις τῆς ἡμέρας, μάλισσα, ἐὰν πνεῦ ἀνεμος. Πάσχει δὲ τὸ πᾶσα τοῦτο ὁ Εὔριπος περὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα. Διὸ καὶ Εὔριπος ὠνόμασται οἱονεὶ ὁ ὑστερησας καὶ εὐρὼς πεφυκώς. Εἰς τοῦτον λέγεται Ἀριστοτέλης ἑαυτὸν ῥῖψαι. Εἴρηται δὲ ἡμῖν τοῦτο καὶ ἐν τῷ α' λόγῳ.* The word *ἀναῤῥόφησις* is cited by Schneider in Lex. from Schol. Lycophr. 743., *Χαρυβδὶς ἡ τῆς θαλάσσης ἀναῤῥόφησις*: in Müller's edition it is by an error of the press printed *ἀναῤῥόφη*. But the word *ἀναῤῥόφη* is not mentioned by Schneider. I suspect that for *ἀναῤῥόφη* we should read, as in the first passage, *ἀναῤῥόφησις*. Most probably it is an error of the press.

These passages from Nonnus may serve to throw much light on an obscure passage in Lycophron, v. 379.:

"Οσων δὲ φλοίσβων ῥαχίας ἀνεκβάτου
Δίναις παλιῤῥοίησιν ἕλκοντος σάλου.

"Ordo paulo implicatior est hic, "Οσων δὲ (sc. *ἀνοδίστοι*) *φλοίσβων σάλου ἀνεκβάτου, ὅπαντες ῥαχίας ἄλλας παλιῤῥοίησιν. Ῥαχίας* intelligam de eo, quando fluctus, diu alluendo, paulatim a continente aliquid telluris abrumpunt, adeoque veluti ad mare pertrahunt." Reichard. "Ἀνεκβάτου δίνας σάλῳ. Euripi immodice fluentis, auctore Pomp. Mel. ii. 7. *Alterno cursu septies die ac septies nocte fluctibus in vicem versis*, v. ibi Tzschucke. Jungi autem possunt δίνας παλιῤ. cum ἀνεκβάτου, vel, ut Reichard. putat, cum ἕλκοντος σάλου. Ῥαχίας, si est accusat. plural. a ῥαχία, *littora exstantiu ac petrosa*, cf. Etym. M. ῥάχις, quæ Euripus ἕλκειν dic. h. e. assultando secum hinc illinc raptare, ut quasi videantur loco moveri atque auferri, vel, ut Reich. explicat, vere abrupta in mare pertrahi, vel, si est genitivus, littoris ἀναῤῥόησιν, quod egressum non dat, sc. navigantibus. Quum vero ῥαχία etiam significet *æstum*, et videatur esse i. q. ῥηγμὶν, sensus existit: *Quantum strepitum æstus egressum negantis, σάλου ἕκα. δὶν. παλιῤ.* v. 380. *maris, quod refluit fluctibus invicem versis*: ut Virg. Georg. iv. 420. canit: *In sinus scindit sese unda reductos.* Prætulerim tamen accusativum plural. *ῥαχίας*, ut ἕλκοντος habeat, quod secum ferat. Quo fit, ut verba sic sint ordinanda: *ὅσων δὲ φλ. σάλου ἀνεκβ. ἕλκοντος ῥαχίας, fluctus, æstum, ἄλλας παλιῤῥοίησιν.* Cf. omnino ad h. l. Quint. Smyrn. xiv. 515. sq." Müller. But, for my own part, I can never be persuaded that Lycophron, with all his affectation of obscurity, ever wrote two lines whose construction was so intricate, as these interpretations of the passage in question produce. Legemeo periculo,

his in literis exercitatissimo, quid de hoc Grammatico mihi sentiendum foret, et primis statim versibus non sine rubore legi quæ de me nimium quam honorifice et amice scribis, et mox majorem etiam pudori meo et modestiæ vim intulisti, me principibus permiscens viris. Amicitia, qua me complecteris, tibi fucum facit; non is sum quem putas; sum mediocris inter mediocres. Lubens intellexi non parvum ad nostra studia fructum e vulgato Arcadio esse exspectandum, tibique gratulor cui hunc debebimus.

"In voce *Τρόχοος*, quæ te impedit p. 167., non credo latere epithetum τετρασύλλαβον, sed mutato τ in π, quod est confusionis genus solenne, lego omnino *Πρόχοος*. Hanc accentus sedem in voce *Πρόχοος* notavit et Etym. M. p. 93. 40.: *Τὰ μετὰ προθέσεως συντιθέμενα προπαροξύνονται, πρόπολος, πρόχοος.*

"Vocem *Δυσκόος*, cujus sensum te percipere ibidem negas, sensu vacare equidem puto, utpote corruptam; et epitheta vicina *λαοσσόος*, *βροτοσσόος* me ad conjiciendum impellunt latere hic adjectivum ejusdem formationis; nihilque propius esse videtur voci depravatæ, quam *δυσσοος*,[1] quod tibi fidenter propono. Nam hoc fere malo quam compositum quærere cujus altera pars sit *κόος*, quod Lacones pro *μέγας* usurpabant.

"P. 168. *Ἰνάρως* non semel apud Historicos reperitur. Vide Diodorum xi. 71. cum Wesselingii nota, cui adde Schol. Pluti ad v. 178. ubi *Ἰνάρως*.

"P. 169. *Σωχάρης* est nomen, non Dei, nec Persæ, sed homi-

Ὅσων δὲ φλοίσβων ῥαχίας ἀνεκβάτου,
Δίνειας παλιρρόησιν ἑλκούσης * σάλος, vel σάλον.

(For σάλος τὸ was in use. Apollonius Dysc. de Pronom. p. 75. ed. Bekker: Δωριεῖς τῆνος· Καθηγημένος θὴν καὶ τῆνος ὑπὸ τῶ χρόνω, Σώφρων. Σπανίως διὰ τοῦ κ. Καὶ κεῖνος ἐν σάλεισιν πολλοῖς ἥμενος, Ἀλκμάν. Schneider in his Lexicon has cited the verse from Alcman, but has inadvertently substituted τῆνος for κεῖνος. The meaning of Apollonius, however, plainly requires κεῖνος, not τῆνος.) Ῥαχία is here taken in the sense so well illustrated by Nonnus, and the force of the epithet ἀνέκβατος, will be sufficiently understood by those who attend to the concluding words in the first quotation from Nonnus.

ΑΠΙΣ. While I have the work of Nonnus in my hands, I may as well mention, what is unknown, I think, to all the commentators on Suidas, that the following passage in Suidas, quoted in a note to the Index to the new Greek Thesaurus sub v. Ἄπις: Ἀπίδες· θεοὶ ἦσαν, τιμώμενοι παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις, σημεῖον ἔχοντες περὶ τὴν οὐρὰν καὶ τὴν γλῶσσαν, δηλοῦν εἶναι αὐτούς. Ἄπιδας· οἷς γεγνωμένοις διὰ χρόνου, ὡς ἔλεγον, ἐκ τοῦ σίλλας τῆς σιλήνης, ἑορτὴν μεγάλην ἦγον, καὶ ἱερεῖς τινες περὶ τὸν τιχθέντα βοῦν ἱερῶντο [ἱεροῦντο], παρατιθέντες πανδαισίαν, ὡς τὠχοῦντες αὐτοῖς: is taken from the said Nonnus p. 169. whose words run thus:—Οἱ δὲ Ἄπιδες, βοῦς εἶσι τιμώμενοι παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις· ἐτίκτοντο δὲ οὗτοι, καθαιροῦ δή τινες ἐν τῷ πρὶν χρόνῳ, καὶ σημεῖον εἶχόν τι, ὃ δηλοῦν αὐτοὺς εἶναι Ἄπιδας. Ἐγεννῶντο δὲ διὰ χρόνου πολλοῦ. Ἐπὰν δὲ ἐγεννήθησαν, ἑορτὴν μεγάλην ἦγεν οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι· καὶ ἱερεῖς τινες περὶ τὸν γεννηθέντα βοῦν, οἵτινες ἱεροῦντο αὐτῷ τῷ βοΐ. See Jablonski's Pantheon Æg. iv. 2. 4.

[1] H. Stephens and Schneider thus accent the word, δύσσοος, and so it is marked in all the editions of Theocr. iii. 21. Ὤ μοι ἐγὼ, τί πάθω; τί δ' δύσσοος; οὐχ ὑπακούεις;

nis Græci, apud Plutarchum Cimon. Vit.: cf. not. ad Herodot. ix. 73.

"Hæc habui quæ te monerem. Vale, vir amicissime. Lutet. d. xxiii. m. Apr. 17."

I have no hesitation in expressing my entire assent to all the critical remarks of the no less modest than learned Professor, except the last; for there can be little doubt that *Σωχάρης* is a false reading in the passage of Plutarch for *Σωφάνης*. See the notes of Wesseling and Valckenaër ad Herod. l. c. The Professor therefore must produce some other passage, where *Σωχάρης* means "nomen Græci hominis," before I can renounce my conjectures.

E. H. B.

TRANSLATION FROM TIMOCREON.

THE following is a free translation of a fragment of a Greek *scolium*, or catch,[1] written, as the ancient commentator on Aristophanes tells us, by Timocreon of Rhodes. It has been usual to consider it as a complete poem:[2] but we have the authority of the above-mentioned writer, who has quoted it not less than twice, for its being nothing more than the opening stanza of one.[3]

Blind Plutus, god of wealth! nor isle, nor sea,
Nor continent were made for thee.
Aroynt thee, imp! to Tart'rus go,—
To Stygian darkness, and the shades below.
For sure, if aught upon this earth
Savoureth of ill, thou gavest it birth:
From thee all evil thoughts began,
Thou great, first ruiner of man.[4]

Timocreon, we are informed, was a writer of The Old Comedy. He is said to have had frequent bickerings with Simonides, the lyric

---

[1] Σκολιὰ λέγονται τὰ παροίνια ἄσματα. Scholiast on Aristoph. Ran. 1337. So that the word was well rendered *catch* by Dr. Bentley.

[2] As such it is treated in *Bland's Collections from the Greek Anthology; &c.*

[3] Τιμοκρέων δὲ ὁ Ῥόδιος, ἐποποιὸς, τοιοῦτον ἔγραψε σκολιὸν κατὰ τοῦ Πλούτου, οὗ ἡ ἀρχή· Ὤφελες κ. τ. λ. Scholiast, as above. Compare the same Annotator, on Acharn. 531. where Timocreon is called μελοποιός.

[4] Ὤφελές γ', ὦ τυφλὲ Πλοῦτε,
Μήτε γῆ, μήτ' ἐν θαλάσσῃ,
Μήτ' ἐν ἠπείρῳ φανῆναι,
Ἀλλὰ Τάρταρόν τε ναίειν
Κἀχέροντα· διὰ σὲ γὰρ
Πάντ' ἐν ἀνθρώποις κακά.

poet, and likewise with Themistocles; both of whom he did not fail to lash severely in his poetry. He is even reported to have held them up to ridicule on the stage, and to have had the effrontery publicly to brand the latter personage with the appellation of "a traitor." He is parodied more than once by Aristophanes; but is never treated by that author otherwise than with respect.

Nor was he less famed for his voracity (a quality which he possessed in common with the poet Alcman), and for his skill in wrestling and boxing; being spoken of by Ælian and Athenæus, as a great poet, a great pugilist, a great wrestler, and a great glutton. An anecdote is related of him by the latter of these writers, that, as he was dining one day with the King of Persia, and cramming his maw most ravenously, the monarch, on observing it, could not help asking him "What feat he would perform next?" *I'll exchange a fist*, replied Timocreon, *with any number of Persians you choose to pitch against me one by one.* Preparations were accordingly made next day for the boxing-match,—a posse of 'men of the glove' was brought forward,—and Timocreon 'milled' his antagonists to a man. The labour thus over, Timocreon proceeds furiously to buffet the air;[1] insomuch that the King was astonished, and desired to know the meaning of it. *May it please your Majesty*, quoth Timocreon gravely,—*those last were blows, that I had kept in reserve to play off upon fresh comers*;[2] humourously intimating, as Casaubon observes, that he was still as vigorous, and as heavy in the arm, as at the first setting-out. The King was, of course, mightily taken with the joke; and, for aught that I know, made him free of his table ever after.

We have said before, that Timocreon was not on the best of terms with Simonides; and that he had even gone so far, as to make him the butt of his ridicule and of his satire. Simonides, however, was 'a man of metre' too; and, "when Greek met Greek," we might be

---

[1] Those, who know not what it is *to box in a glass*, may compare Virgil's fifth Æneid, as translated by Dryden:

> His brawny back, and ample breast he shows;
> His lifted arms around his head he throws,
> And deals in whistling air his empty blows.

[2] As if the blows, which he had in store from the first, were limited to a certain number. This story reminds me of a circumstance, somewhat the same in kind, that happened within my memory. A student at C. C. C. C. while at morning-lectures, happened to be seized with a fit of laughter, which he found some difficulty in repressing. The infection, as might be expected, began to spread; and the author, being observed by the lecturer, was ordered, either to desist, or, if he must needs laugh, to go out-of-doors, and laugh there. With more *sang-froid* than the Belgian captain at Waterloo, the student chose the latter alternative; and, as soon as he had closed the door, burst out immediately into what, by some of our northern friends, is termed *a horse-godmother-laugh*. This done, he returned to his place in the lecture-room with an air as grave and as composed, as if nothing at all had been the matter. The quantum of laughter, first generated, was by this time, it should seem, expended; and, like Timocreon with his blows, he had so much to laugh away, and no more.

sure that there would be "warm work." He retaliated, we learn, by writing upon him a distich,—an *epitaphium vivi auctoris*, we would fain believe,—which comprises in it as large a portion of sarcasm, as I remember to have seen expressed within the same compass. To edge it the better, he put it into the mouth of Timocreon himself. I have, with I know not what success, attempted a translation of it.

Epitaph on Timocreon.

Born but to press the earth, I press it on,
My birth-place Rhodes, my name Timocreon;
The sum of all I did, or had in mind,—
To eat, to drink, and to abuse mankind.[1]

VERBEIANUS.

GREEK SAPPHIC ODE.

—Crinemque timendi
Sideris, et terris mutantem regna cometen.
LUCAN.

Αἰθ' ἐπαμβαίνοιμ' Ἑλικῶνος ἀγνὸν
Δασκίω ποσσὶν λέπας, ἦχι Μοῖσαι
Ἄθροοι μολπηδὸν ἰεῖσι πάμφω-
νον μέλος αὐλᾶν·
Ὡς δίκαν τεῦς, Αἰολιδέσσι χορδαῖς,
Λεσβία Σαπφοῖ, λιγυρώτερόν τι
Ἐκχέοιμ' ἀπὸ στόματος.—Ματὰν τοὶ
Ἔρκος ὀδόντων
Τὤπος ἐκπέφευγε· τὺ γὰρ, μελικτᾶν
Πέρροχος καὶ Ἑλλαδα, καλλινίκω
Ἕλλαχες φάμας στεφάνωμ' ἄκρον, πρεσ-
βαίδα τιμάν.
—Τί πρόσω; τί δὴ φοβεραὶ κατ' αἶαν
Ἐκπεχείμανται φρένες; ὦ Βρέτανναι,
Ἦρ' ἴδεσθ' ἀτυζόμενοι τέρας τι,
Νυκτὸς ἀμολγῷ,

[1] Πολλὰ φαγὼν καὶ πολλὰ πιὼν, καὶ πολλὰ κάκ' εἰπὼν
Ἀνθρώπους, κεῖμαι Τιμοκρέων Ῥόδιος.

Ἄγριον ;—Καὶ μὰν σέλας ὀππάτεσσιν
Εἰσορῶ φαοσφόρον ἐν πτυχαῖσιν
Αἰθέρος· βολᾶν δ' ἄπο μυρίοι σπιν-
θῆρες ἵενται.
Ἠνίδ' ὡς, περὶ ζαθέαν σελάναν,
Ἀψ ἀποκρύπτοντι φαεννὸν εἶδος
Ἀστέρες δείους ὕπο,—χὡς τρομεῦντι
Πράονες ἄκροι
Ὠρέων, ναπᾶν τε βάθος· τοῖον γὰρ
Ταλόθεν λάμπει φάος, οἷον ὁ Ζεὺς
Ἦχ', ὅκ' ἀστράπτει κατὰ γᾶν ἀπ' αἰγλά-
εντος Ὀλύμπω.
—Ἦ ὑπῆλθε δεῖμά με, μὴ κακόν τι
Ἐκπέσῃ ; Γᾶ μᾶτερ, ἐκὰς μάλ' ἔστω,
Λὶ 'πί σ' ἄτλατον τόδ' ἐπ' ἄκμοσιν τεκ-
ταίνεται Ἄτα.
Πᾶ 'φύγεν τὸ πρὶν θράσος, ἐλπίδος τε
Τὤνομ' ; ἔξωθεν πολέμων θύελλαι,
Ὅπλα θ', ὑσμῖναί τε· —μέσῳ 'μφαλῷ γᾶς
Ἄλλοθεν ἄλλα
Ἁ Στάσις κραιπνοῖς ποσὶν ἐμβατεύει·—
Τίς κακῶν ἄρηξις ;—ἴτ', ἐγκονεῖτε,—
Νῦν ἀγὼν ζοᾶς πέρι, καὶ τέκνων, καὶ
Πατρίδος αἴας.
Βάσκ' ἴθ', ὦ Βρέτανε, τεᾶν ἀπ' ἀκτᾶν
Οὔλιον τὠνειδος ἐλᾶν·—κελεύει σ'
Ἀγλαὸν γένος προγόνων ἀλάλκειν
Δούλιον ἆμαρ.
Ἀλλ' ἔτι κνώσσεις ; ἐπί σοι, λέων ὡς,
Κρύβδα παπταίνων, ὁ δολοπλόκος παῖς
Γαλλίας κάκ' ἐν φρεσὶ πολλὰ τεύχει·
Ἔγρεο, πατρὶς,
Ἐξ ὕπνω νῦν, αἴ ποκ'·—ἐπὶ ξυρῷ 'κμᾶς
Ἵσταται τὸ πρᾶγμα·—διασπάρασσε
Δούλιον ζεύγλαν ποδί, λὰξ πατήσας·—
Ἔρπ' ἐς ἀγῶνα,—
Ἕρπε,—μὴ φόβος σε τινασσέτω τις·—
Ἐν χεροῖν ἔτ' ἐντὶν ἁλιῤῥόθιο
Βένθεος κλαῖδες· ἔτ' εἶ τεᾶν ἄ-
νασσα θαλαττᾶν.

Εἶεν ὦν·—Πρὸς ταῦτα μελάμπεπλος νὺξ
Ἐκχέσι πλῆθος τεράων κατ' ὄρφναν·—
Ἀστέρες τ', ἐκλάμπετ'·—Ἴτω πυρὸς τα-
λεσκόπος αἴγλα·—
Ῥᾶον ἂν γναμπταὶ σπιλάδες κατ' ἀκτὰν
Ἐξερείποιντ', ἢ τὺ, Βρέτανν'· Ὁ Δεὺς γὰρ
Σφόδρ' ἀέξει τὸν μεμαῶτ' ἀμύνεσ-
θαι περὶ πάτρας.

J. B. Trin. Coll. Camb. 1812.

GREEK AND LATIN EPIGRAMS.

Miraturque nihil, nisi quod Libitina sacravit.
HORAT.

Ὡς οἶνος, τὸ μέλισμ'· ἐπεὶ οὐτιδανὸν καὶ ἄτιμον
Ἀμφότερον, πρὶν ἴδῃ γῆρας ἐπερχόμενον.

PRISCÆ Cottylus incubans monetæ,
Nummos colligit indies vetustos:
Si, "Cuinam," rogites, "bono?"—quid ipse
Dicat Cottylus, autumare non est.

J. B. Trin. Coll. Camb. 1812.

VINDICATION

Of the Translation of ARRIAN'S PERIPLUS *of the* EUXINE SEA.

MR. RENNEL, after an interval of twelve years from the publication of the work, which, it seems, gives him so much offence, has thought proper, in an angry note to his *Illustrations of Xenophon's Anabasis*, to censure with no small acrimony the translator of *Arrian's Periplus of the Euxine Sea*, and this in terms which imply a personal reflection on the Translator. This was altoge-

ther unjustifiable, as it was both unprovoked, and unfounded. The author of that work spoke of Mr. RENNEL, as of a man, "whose knowledge and abilities he respected, and on that account thought it incumbent on him to state his reasons for thus differing from him in opinion." If Mr. RENNEL's desire of praise be not satisfied with this eulogium, the Translator can offer with truth nothing further to soothe his anger, or deprecate his resentment.

Mr. RENNEL's note sets out with complimenting the author of the obnoxious work with the title of a learned Grecian, an epithet ironically introduced. Mr. RENNEL's own work would have been more unexceptionable, could he himself have been *seriously* complimented with the same title.

The reader of the book might be led to think that the author of the translation of the Periplus had written that work to controvert Mr. R.'s opinions respecting the length of the stadium, and the rate of the sailing of ancient ships, and that the two dissertations were written apparently with a view to lessen the reputation of Mr. R.'s book. But are Mr. R.'s ideas of his own consequence and merits so lofty as to admit of no contradiction to his opinions, without ascribing unworthy motives to those who oppugn them? The author of those dissertations composed them as literary discussions, which he, or any other person, had as good a right to undertake as Mr. R., who has not informed the public, that he possesses any patent of monopoly for enquiries into ancient Geography. Were the publication a transaction of yesterday, it might be accounted a palliation of such improper insinuations respecting the motives, but surely a space of twelve years should be sufficient to cool geographical ire, or at least to reduce the expression of it into more decorous language. The success of Mr. R.'s publications is a matter as indifferent to the translator of the Periplus, as it may be interesting to their author. Those of Mr. R., as well as the translator, are alike objects of criticism, and will be regarded as such, notwithstanding any complaint, or expression of soreness from those, who are mortified with the liberty taken in examining them.

What may appear extraordinary, Mr. R. declines entering into a defence of those opinions, of the opposition to which he was so jealous, but rather chooses to leave them to the judgment of the public. The translator is perfectly willing to refer them to this decision, and is in no pain on account of the event.

Mr. R. alleges, that the translator has "for want of reflection led himself into some very ridiculous errors." Into these mistakes, which Mr. R. thinks so ridiculous, the translator was led by Mr. R. himself. The former presumed, that when Greek measures were in question, the author would have reckoned

by stadia, or by multiples of stadia, as Strabo has done, and not by geographical miles or minutes on the Equator, of which Herodotus had no idea.

Mr. R., however, supposes for the translator, that he had substituted miles of about 87 to a degree instead of those of 60. If Mr. R. had read the work with due reflection, the want of which he is so forward to condemn, he might have discovered, that the author ascribed with M. D'Anville 600 stadia=75, not 87 Greek miles to a degree on the Equator.

The translator is willing to refer to the public, whether the notes of admiration, which Mr. R. has placed at the end of this sentence, do not belong to his own blunders, as justly as to those of the translator.

But when Mr. R. is so free in ridiculing the blunders of others, the public may perhaps cast a glance on his own. What must the learned, or even the unlearned world, think of his discovery, that the schoolmen (Qe. whom he means by this term?) had supplied a deficiency in the text of Polybius, by placing a figure of *eight*, where a *nine* had originally stood? The only comment upon this emendation of the text is, that Polybius wrote 220 years before the commencement of the Christian era, and the Arabic cyphers, which Mr. R. supposes he employed, were not introduced or known in Europe before the 14th century; or at least 1500 years later than the age of Polybius.

Mr. R., in a kind of Postscript to his note, has suggested that the translator's mistakes do not end here, for among others he has omitted a whole line of distance in the translation, which might very much mislead a geographer, who followed him.

It is very clear from this captious observation, that Mr. R. could not have read the work he is so desirous to censure. The distance between the River Achæus and the Herculean Promontory is stated to be in the translation 180, instead of 150 stadia, and the distance from the Herculean Promontory to another promontory, (a hundred and eighty stadia) is omitted altogether. But if Mr. R. had turned to page 77 of the Dissertation he would have found this mistake corrected. The words of the amended translation are, "From the Achæus to Prom. Herculis 150 stadia. From Prom. Herc. to another promontory 180 stadia." In the Table or Summary of the Distances, this mistake is again corrected (page 100). Mr. R. does no credit to his own candour in selecting this mistake, which is twice corrected in other parts of the book, from others which he lays to the charge of the translator, but does not think proper to specify.

April 1817. *F.*

AN ACCOUNT

Of Researches made among the Ruins of Pompeii, in 1813.

THE beautiful representations of Pompeian antiquities lately published from the drawings of Sir William GELL and Mr. GANDY having given additional interest to this subject; our readers will probably be gratified in perusing the brief abstract here offered of a French work which we have reason to believe extremely rare in England. It is an octavo volume comprising ninety-three pages, closely printed, and fifteen plates, besides an engraved frontispiece, exhibiting the simple title of POMPEI. But the first page describes it as an Account of Researches made at Pompeii, in presence of her majesty the queen of the Two Sicilies (for so is here qualified Madame Murat) in the months of March and May, 1813. "Fouille faite à Pompei, &c." From a signature which occurs in p. 50, the author of this work appears to be Mons. de Clarac—and most of the plates that illustrate it, have been engraved from his designs.

It is almost unnecessary to inform the classical reader that in the year of Christ, 79, Pompeii, which Seneca has described as the most celebrated city in this part of Campania, was overwhelmed by an eruption of burning ashes from Mount Vesuvius; having suffered much from an earthquake fifteen years before;—the buried city was accidentally discovered in the last century, and various excavations since made, have brought to light a street of tombs—a Temple of Isis—a villa—a Theatre—several shops and small dwelling houses—a barrack or guard-room, and other edifices—with some skeletons, and several articles of domestic furniture, besides pictures, medals, &c. From p. 2. of the volume before us, we learn that it was resolved in 1812, to ascertain the original extent of this city, by clearing from earth and cinders the walls which surrounded it, and which are supposed to form a circuit of 1600 or 1700 toises. Some of these walls are of considerable strength, and above twenty feet in certain places—fortified with a sort of towers in which are posterns. Those ramparts are nearly twelve feet thick. It appears that they have undergone repairs not long before the destruction of the city; probably after it had been besieged by Sylla, and after the earthquake in the year 63 of Christ.

In clearing the grand street which passes before the Temple of Isis, and apparently crosses the whole city, intersected occasionally by others, the workmen having descended to the ancient pavement, and opened the entrance to the great portico of the theatre, were engaged in digging near the surface, among ashes and cinders, above which was little more than one foot of vegetative earth.—Here it seemed improbable that any thing curious should be found, and they were about to desist, when one of them discovered a bone—then a whole

skeleton—some medals of brass and silver, and one of gold—after this, a considerable number appeared, and many of the small gold coins (of the Roman Emperors) were as fresh as when they first issued from the mint.—It is supposed that the unfortunate proprietor, whom death arrested in his flight, had carefully endeavoured to preserve this gold,—for it was separated from the other coins of inferior value, and wrapped in a piece of stuff, so totally decomposed that it mouldered away immediately on being touched.—But the other medals were contained in a purse or rather a large wrapper of linen made from flax or hemp, and like that used at present. Some of this ancient linen is still so strong, that, after a lapse of seventeen centuries, it cannot be easily torn.

From the situation of the skeleton, covered only with a thin coat of earth, and lying over a bed of ashes ten feet deep, we may perceive how rapid and abundant must have been the shower of cinders which buried Pompeii, at the moment when this unfortunate person attempted, but in vain, to save himself.—Many other bodies were discovered, on the same day, as the skeleton above mentioned. A mother dragging after her two young daughters, and pressing to her bosom a little infant, appears to have fallen a victim to the burning ashes, near the wall of the portico in the street of tombs.—They seem to have crowded together; their bones are so intermixed that it is probable the mother and her children expired in each other's embraces. That they were a family of some opulence and even elegance, may be inferred from their gold rings and other ornaments: one ring is in the form of a serpent with many folds; another, which from its small size we may suppose to have been worn by a young girl, is mounted with a garnet bearing the device of a thunderbolt. The ear-rings resemble little balances or scales, of which the basins are represented by pearls suspended by a golden thread. (Similar ear-rings are preserved in the Cabinet des Antiques at Paris.) Two of the pearls are sufficiently perfect; the others have suffered.

In most of the houses explored at Pompeii, the reservoirs or cisterns for water are generally of marble, and situated in the midst of small courts, *(impluvium)*. It appears that at the moment when this city was destroyed by the eruption, one of the houses was actually in a state of reparation: many pieces of marble and handsome tiles were found heaped together just below the wall, as ready for the workmen, who were to finish with them the edge of the roof, and to form the gutters. These tiles are well-shaped and ornamented with figures of dogs and foxes. One picture was discovered in this house: it is neatly and spiritedly executed, and represents (on a red ground,) Peace holding in the right hand an olive-branch, and in the left a cornucopiæ. Besides some sculptures in white marble, the houses above-mentioned offered many interesting objects; locks and other fastenings of doors both of brass and iron, and in several respects not unlike those at present in use among us, a balance or pair of scales with brass bowls about five inches in diameter, and hung by well-wrought chains: the weight used with this balance is a pretty bronze

head covered with a helmet; here were also a magnificent *candelabra* of bronze four feet and a half high, of which the upper part terminates in a vase, formed like that generally styled the *Vase de Medicis*. Some vessels for culinary purposes were, likewise, found here,—many being of bronze and well-shaped; several with handles elegantly fluted and ending in heads of animals executed with much taste. One, in particular, the head of a dog, is very remarkable.—Among the most curious of those vessels we may undoubtedly reckon that which was dug up on the 18th of March, 1813. It is a large bronze dish with a double bottom; the object of which must have been to keep hot whatever meat was placed in it, by means of warm water.

Many glass vessels were found.—It is probable that the inhabitants of Pompeii when flying from the destructive eruption, endeavoured to carry with them only such articles as they deemed most precious, and left their glass vessels, and similar things, as of little value. There are numerous drinking glasses of extraordinary forms; and one glass vase, six inches high, and shaped like a chalice. Bottles, phials, and small vessels, abound here, all made of glass, not very white. Some, indeed, are of a clouded blue or greenish colour, but none of this ancient glass can bear a comparison with that which we are now capable of making.—Various cups of red earth have been found among the furniture of those houses; some are finely executed and enriched with foliage and figures in relief.

I shall now, says M. de Clarac, (p. 13.) conduct my readers to the ancient tombs, indicating those which have been recently discovered: the others will be sufficiently known from the work on which Mons. Mazois is now employed: he will describe the porticoes, bordering the street of tombs; and a fine insulated monument constructed in the form of a niche.—From the situation of this monument, and the stone seat that extends all around it on the inside, we may suppose that it served as a resting-place, or a spot where the idle inhabitants of Pompeii were wont to meet.—The first tomb on the left is of little interest, and those opposite have been much injured; but the tombs nearest to the first mentioned are highly curious, and may be regarded as among the most important discoveries made in this wonderful scene of antiquities. Those four tombs stand, each, within walls, between which and the monuments, an interval of three feet is left. These walls are, in general, ornamented at the angles with little allegorical figures of Stucco, in bas-relief. Many of these devices are damaged, but we can still distinguish that subject which has engaged the attention of so many artists: Œdipus solving the enigma of the Sphinx. Other bas-reliefs represent Fortune on a globe—genii—a woman consecrating a wreath or fillet at an altar—another woman decorating a skeleton with fillets or wreaths. The door by which we enter the outer inclosure of this tomb is very low, and obliges us to stoop. The first tomb has been much injured in the upper part by the roots of trees which have insinuated themselves. Many of the stucco reliefs that ornamented the walls have fallen off and mouldered

into dust; but fortunately M. Morelli, draughtsman of the Royal Academy, and M. Mazois, have made beautiful and accurate drawings of their subjects.

Here was found a large inscribed tablet of marble, which though mutilated at one corner, gives us reason to hope that an equestrian statue may yet be discovered in the forum; at least if that statue which the *Decuriones* of Pompeii decreed to ——ricius Scaurus, was ever executed or erected.—The inscription is as follows:

····RICIO · A · F · MEN
SCAVRO
II · VIR · I · D
··ECVRIONES · LOCVM · MONVM
·CXↃCXↃ · IN · FVNERE · ET · STATVAM · EQVESTR.
·ORO · PONENDAM · CENSVERVNT
SCAVRVS · PATER · FILIO

The first word of this inscription our author once supposed belonging to *Fabricius*, but for causes explained in a note, (p. 18.) he rather believes the name to have been *Castricius*. The exterior wall, facing the street, exhibits bas-reliefs in stucco, representing the combats of two young *Bestiarii* (gladiators who fought with beasts) one overthrowing and killing a bear; the other having wounded a bull with his dart, appears frightened, and begins to run off. Here we also behold hunters with dogs, attacking an enormous wild-boar. It is evident that some of these reliefs had been repaired before the destruction of the city; and where the stucco has fallen off, one can perceive that the original or more ancient work was much superior to the later. Those reliefs were fastened to the walls by means of nails, not all of brass, which is to be regretted, as those of iron have by their rust considerably injured the stucco.

The combats of gladiators, in which the people of Campania much delighted, are represented in a bas-relief comprising seventeen figures; many names, painted in black, near the figures, are now obliterated. Another tomb constructed of brick, in the form of a round tower about fifteen feet high, and coated with white stucco, is in good preservation. The ascent is by a small staircase; within are some cinerary urns of coarse clay, still containing ashes and bones not quite consumed by fire. Two other tombs, chiefly of white marble, are enriched with ornaments executed in a good style. To the first tomb no entrance could be discovered: and it was supposed that the door had been filled up and covered with plaster. An attempt was therefore made to penetrate from above, but it proved to be a solid structure, and merely an honorary monument. The ornaments of this building serve to explain some inscriptions which have hitherto perplexed the antiquaries: for they had not well determined what was signified by the "honor of the *Bisellium*," accorded to various personages. But these tombs attest that it was decreed to C. Calventius Quietus, and to C. Munatius Faustus; while the sculptures exhibit the form of the *Bisellium*; and we find that the honor granted was the

privilege of occupying alone, a seat capable of holding two persons, at public assemblies. The *Bisellium* appears to have been a seat sufficiently long for two, and without back or arms; the feet richly ornamented, and it is furnished with a fringed cushion.—The inscription informs us that the honor of sitting on it was conferred by the Decurions with consent of the people. We shall here copy two of the inscriptions. The first tomb exhibits these words:

C · CALVENTIO · QVIETO ·
AVGVSTALI
HVIC · OB · MVNIFICENT · DECVRIONVM
DECRETO · ET · POPVLI · CONSENSV · BISELLII ·
HONOR · DATVS · EST ·

The second tomb bears the following inscription:

NAEVOLEIA · I · LIB · TYCHE · SIBI · ET
C · MVNATIO · FAVSTO · AVG · ET · PAGANO ·
CVI · DECVRIONES · CONSENSV · POPVLI ·
BISELLIVM · OB · MERITA · EIVS · DECREVERVNT ·
HOC · MONIMENTVM · NAEVOLEIA · TYCHE · LIBERTIS · SVIS
LIBERTABVSQVE · ET · C · MVNATI · FAVSTI · VIVA · FECIT ·

The name of another female who bore the name of Tyche, appears on a sepulchral stone near the tomb of Scaurus, before mentioned. The inscription is as follows:

IVNONI
TYCHES · IVLIAE
AVGVSTAE · VENER

"Sacred to Juno, the protectress of Julia Tyche; and to Venus Augusta,"—for this title is given to the goddess of beauty in several inscriptions. This grave-stone, like many others at Pompeii, is upright. Several of them are surmounted with a globe or kind of ball, cut through the middle, but much resembling the Turkish tombstones, which terminate in the form of a turban, or some similar head-dress.

On the face of an altar we discern the sculptured figure of a ship, with a square-sail such as the painter has assigned to the vessel in a picture once belonging to the Temple of Isis, but now preserved at Portici. The ship appears decked, and the details of its parts are so curious that Mons. de Clarac has enriched this work with an engraved representation, which proves that it differs much from the ships seen on medals or in ancient pictures: it does not seem to have been designed for the purposes of war. Other reliefs found here exhibit funeral ceremonies, and the consecration or sacrifice of a bird on an altar, by a child. Inside one of the tombs, two rows of small niches appear destined to receive the urns; four of these urns are covered with lids of coarse clay. Three larger urns were enclosed in cases of lead, one resembling an egg in form. Many of the urns are fifteen inches high, and ten broad, having very narrow necks, to which are fitted covers or stoppers of glass, stuck on with plaster

or stucco. Some of this composition also was found in a small pot.

But one of the most extraordinary discoveries made at Pompeii, is the water or liquor which entirely covered up to the very opening of two glass vases, the ashes that they contained; while those remains of human bodies found in earthen or marble urns, are invariably dry and little more than dust. Our ingenious author considers it probable that as the glass is exceedingly thin, water was poured on the hot ashes or bones, as taken from the funeral pile, to prevent the cracking or breaking of the vases from heat. And it is well known that the ancients often made libations of wine on the remains of their deceased friends. In one glass urn the water is perfectly tasteless, and so clear that the bones and ashes are seen through it: the liquid contained in the other urn is of a dark brownish color, resembling coffee well strained; both are without any scent, and the brownish liquid has a faint taste not unlike that of lye-water, (eau de lessive). May we attribute its dark color to the decomposition of animal substance?—the salts contained in the bones and ashes? However this may be, both the liquids should have corresponded: but perhaps some coins or other pieces of metal have tinged the one. It is not ascertained by any chymical analysis, whether the liquid is water, wine, or some perfume poured on the ashes: but of one circumstance we are assured, its antiquity. During such a lapse of ages, all evaporation had been prevented by the close covering of the vases, the leaden cases, and the great mass of earth that concealed the tomb. And these, at the same time, would not admit even the smallest drop of water that might have penetrated through the external coat of earth, or through the building. Near each of those urns were found lamps made of red clay, and a considerable number appeared in a corner of the tomb, as if reserved for occasional use. Some pieces of brass money were also found near the remains of each person here deposited.

A few statues of mean execution, and several inscriptions were discovered near some tombs which are in a state of decay, the roots of trees having forced themselves through the coat of earth above those monuments.

On the first of May, 1813, other tombs and a fine vase of oriental alabaster were found, besides a gold ring in which is set an agate, exhibiting the figure of a deer. Inside the tomb is a low seat of stone-mason work; and standing against the wall are seen many long and pointed *Amphoræ*, such as were generally used for holding wine, but sometimes as cinerary vases, being filled with the ashes of children.

The door of this tomb is very remarkable; it consists of one solid piece of marble three feet and a half high, two feet, nine inches wide, and above four inches thick: it turned on pivots of the same stone. Near the city walls, three houses are now explored: they had been inhabited, probably, by persons of the lower classes. The rooms were without pictures on the walls, or other ornaments except some rude Mosaic pavements. They contained several kitchen utensils of

bronze: one vessel seemed adapted for cooling water, and resembled those now used in the kingdom of Naples for that purpose.

In different places were found a small perfume-box, several bronze lamps, ivory counters each marked with a V and some other letter; perhaps serving as tickets of admission to the theatre; a fine cup of clay, highly varnished, and of a most singular form; innumerable objects, not of much importance, are daily found: to describe which would afford but little pleasure to the reader, although they gratify in a high degree those who actually bring them first into light from the obscurity of so many ages.

The latter part of Mons. de Clarac's work is devoted to an explanation of the engravings, which are placed together at the end. They exhibit many curious articles, and the descriptions are extremely interesting, but without plates to which a reference might be made, any extracts of those descriptions would not be very satisfactory. We shall, therefore, here conclude our notice of this entertaining volume.

A CRITICAL

Examination of certain modern opinions respecting the TROAD, *and the descriptions of* HOMER; *and an inquiry into the authorities on which they have been founded.*

BY CHARLES H. PARRY, M. D., F. R. S., &c.

If the successive writings of Wood, Chevalier, Dalzel, Heyne, Bryant, Morritt, Whitaker, Franklin, Vincent, Gell, Clarke, Hobhouse, and various other authors, have tended neither to weaken our classical faith, nor to confirm our earlier judgments with respect to certain Homeric descriptions, we may sometimes discover the causes of our security or indecision, in the negligence or inconsistency of these commentators. While the critical acumen of Bryant obliged us to hesitate for a moment, upon points which before we had never considered doubtful, the discovery of his too palpable subservieney to a favorite hypothesis restored us at once to all our former pleasing associations. The natural line of separation which we were disposed to admit between simple intelligible history, and the wild superstitions of an ignorant heathen people, between the plain record of possible events, and the rich imagination of the most inventive of Poets, could

not but moderate our assent to arguments supported apparently by all the solidity of learning, and generally conducted into our notice with the candor of good breeding, and the independence of a philosophic mind. On the other hand, after a fair investigation of their respective merits, it may not be deemed a presumptuous decision in favor of this author, to assert, that he conducted us safely to the detection of much error in the doctrines of his opponents, and in almost every point where his system did not interfere with his judgment, had an evident advantage as to knowledge and weight of argument, while Chevalier[1] and his respectable followers themselves fell into the very error of system which they had so much deprecated in their venerable antagonist. It is, indeed, amusing to observe with how much facility Morritt, Gell, Franklin, and the British Critic, pass over the most rugged objections of Bryant, and indeed of Homer himself, with regard to the localities of Troy, and the interpretation of certain Homeric phrases. Among many other instances, the defence of the supposed Simois, of the sources of the Scamander, of the remote position of Troy, and of the Tomb of Hector, appears wholly untenable, and the unlimited assent of scholars so illustrious as Prof. Heyne and Dr. Vincent, to positions unsupported by historical evidence, and almost repugnant to common sense, should have the best effect in humbling the critic's pride, and diminishing the influence of authority. It is satisfactory to know that, among the numerous travellers who have visited the Troad, the only gentleman who has made an actual survey of the supposed scene of action, draws very different conclusions from those which have been adopted with so much zeal by so many learned critics, and in opposition to the precise local knowledge and discoveries of Professor Carlyle,[2] and the circumstantial evidence which may be deduced from the narrative of Homer's battles, it is now in vain to assert the barely possible, but highly improbable,

---

[1] It has been said that the original publication of Chevalier was under many unacknowledged obligations to the invention and discoveries of Morritt. English authors need have still less delicacy in asserting their claims to the literary pillage which their neighbours have always been in the habit of levying upon their territory, than even that recently exhibited by the various allied authorities, with regard to spoils of another kind.

[2] Particularly the upper course of the Shemar River, "which particularly," says Rennell, "has perhaps operated more than any other to *restore the ancient system* of the topography of the Troad." (Preface xi. to Observ. on Top. of Troy. 1814.)

consequences, which have been admitted by many very eminent writers.

The following observations have no relation to the supposed errors of Strabo, Demetrius of Scepsis, nor to the geographical information of Pliny. There is no attempt to agitate the question as to the existence of the Asiatic city of Troy, nor to examine the evidence in favor of the Trojan war. I have even little to do with our modern travellers themselves.[1] My principal object is to determine such Homeric localities as seem to have been omitted or too slightly noticed by previous annotators, to answer some defective arguments, to endeavour to establish certain doubtful facts by fair induction, and to confirm by new instances or combinations, various conclusions which have formed the basis of much subsequent reasoning. To the knowledge of such of your readers as may be conversant with the *whole* controversy, I leave it to assign to their intended objects the application of some remarks, and the praise or censure which may, upon occasions, be anonymously conveyed. As few others will feel interested in the subject, I have less scruple in sparing your pages the weight of much unnecessary reference.

It may be allowed me in general to remark that, of the fallacy of Mr. Bryant's hypothesis with regard to the Egyptian site of Troy, three proofs seem deducible from the writings of Homer himself. To omit the voyage of Helen from Sidon to Troy, (Z. 292.) which may have been part of the route from Greece to Phrygia, or to Egypt, Menelaus (Od. Δ.) expressly says he travelled from Troy to Egypt. Ulysses, (Od. Ξ. 246.) performed the same voyage, Achilles particularizes Thebes of Egypt, and lastly, we have a precise description of the topographical relations of the Homeric Troy itself.

The general situation of Troy, or Ilium, is pointed out in a passage which has been too much neglected. In his Speech to Priam (Ω. 544.) Achilles says, (if we can understand the construction of the sentence): you are above Lesbos, which is therefore to the South of Troy, in one direction, *καθύπερθε*, (not East, as the Scholiast and most transla-

---

[1] These subjects have been denominated by Prof. Heyne, extra carmen, *ἐξω τοῦ ἱπποῦ*. See Exc. in Lib. vi. &c. In his elaborate edition of Homer, this learned critic has supplied us with many detached Essays on the topics immediately before us. The present Essay was written before I had had an opportunity of consulting this work. Some views may seem to coincide, which were, in fact, not borrowed, and I have introduced, wherever I have been able, my reasons for differing from so distinguished an authority.

tors have it, but) above, or to the North, lies Phrygia, and in another, the Ἑλλήσποντος ἀπείρων. From the circumstance, that no particular locality is connected with this latter, I should assign it a very natural position in the West, and presume, that the ground, upon which Homer omitted any further description, was the clear evidence that it lay neither to the East, North, nor South.

That the word Τροίη[1] applies equally to the country and the city, is evident from many passages. At A. 129. we find Τροίην πόλιν, and at Ω. 542. Achilles says Ἥμαι ἐνὶ Τροίῃ which can only mean the Troad. This double usage prevents any precise application of the frequent expression νῆας ἐς Τροίην ἠγεῖτο (Π. 168.) Ἐς Τροίην ἀναπλεύσεσθαι (Α. 22.) Νηυσὶν Ἴλιον εἴσω (Σ. 58. 439.) ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθε, &c. (Β. 216.) In these instances Troy or Ilium may refer to the general object of the expedition, and give no information as to the neighbourhood of this city to the Sea. I cannot, however, in this place, help remarking that, with all modern ingenuity and latitude of interpretation, the πρὸς ἅλὸς, (Κ. 428.) is scarcely distinctive or intelligible, under any admissible notions either of the position of Troy or of the Throsmos.

The words Ἴλιος, Τροίη and Πέργαμος are used almost indiscriminately by Homer. It is, at least, difficult to discover their supposed characteristical differences. The two first occur in numberless instances without epithets, and are frequently connected with the same epithet. Besides the examples above noticed, which have probably a different interpretation, the Ἴλιον εἴσω at Ρ. 159. 163. and at Θ. 131. Ξ. 46. &c. evidently means the city of Troy. The residence of Priam was both in Troy and Ilium. At Η. 345. his gates are close to Ἰλίου πόλις ἄκρη, and at Χ. 478. ἐν Τροίῃ, Πριάμου κατὰ δῶμα, occurs. If Ilium was usually distinguished as sacred, we find, Π. 100. Τροίης ἱερὰ κρήδεμνα, and at Ν. 657. Ἴλιον ἱρὴν means only Troy. If Τροίη be εὔπυργος, (Η. 71.) we have also Ζ. 386. the πύργον μέγαν Ἰλίου adjoining the Scæan gate, the most decisive evidence as to the sameness of Troy and Ilium. It must, however, be added that while Τροίη is only distinguished as ὑψίπυλος (Π. 698. Φ. 544.) Ἴλιος alone has the epithets αἰπὺ, αἰπεινὴ, and ἠνεμόεσσα connected with it, the last of which is repeated eight times.

Of Πέργαμος we only know from Homer that the Temple of Apollo was there situated, and that it was on this account, sacred. (Ε. 446.)

---

[1] Pindar has frequent allusions to Troy, see Pythia i. iii. 180. iv. 284. v. 119. vi 34. Nemea iii. 103. vii. 44. 51. viii. 52 Isthm. vi. 45. vii. 111. iv. 439. Olymp. xiii. 73.

It has no other character assigned to it in common with Troy or Ilium, and if we have, (Z. 512.) κατὰ Περγάμου ἄκρης we find κατ' ἄκρης connected also with Ilium, (N. 773.) That there was an ἄκρα πόλις, we learn from many passages, and that it contained the Temple of Ἀθηναίη ἀγελείη. If, however, the πόλει ἀκροτάτῃ, (X. 172.) refers to Pergamus, we are not so informed by Homer, and that the ἄκρην πόλιν, (X. 381.) means Troy in general, will, I think, appear clear from the circumstances with which it is connected in this passage. The ἀκρόπολις was certainly not the most elevated ground,[1] as appears from Od. Θ. 494. 504. &c. and the subsequent proposal Ἦ κατὰ πετρῶων βαλέειν ἐρύσανταs ἐπ' ἄκραs (508.) The contiguity, too, of Pergamus to the Scæan Gate, and the neighbourhood of the Trojan Plain, is rendered probable from the fact, that, from this situation, Cassandra not only discovered her Father returning, but even the body of Hector on the bier, a circumstance which could not easily have happened from the recent position of the supposed Acropolis. If we compare Δ. 508 and 514, it seems as if Περγάμου and πτόλιος were synonymous.

The words πόλις and ἄστυ are also used by Homer without discrimination. At P. 160. we find the ἄστυ μέγα Πριάμοιο, and at Φ. 532, προτὶ ἄστυ, Φ. 128, ἄστυ Ἰλίου, meaning the city in general. At Φ. 607. 610. ἄστυ and πόλις are decidedly the same. We may therefore conclude that they were so at P. 144. and X. 433.

The particular site of Troy has been deduced from the well-known passage, Υ. 216.

Ἴλιος ἱρὴ
Ἐν πεδίῳ πεπόλιστο πόλις, &c.

While, however, some authors, (Bryant and the Edinb. Reviewer) suppose the Homeric phrase to express an entirely level position, both of the town and neighbouring country, others have placed it on an eminence; (Chevalier, &c.) and a third party (Morritt, Franklin, Vincent, &c.) partly on a level with the plain, (the city) and partly on a hill, (the Acropolis.) There is, however, no reason, from any description furnished by Homer, nor from any evidence that may be collected from his writings, to believe that any part of Troy was on level ground, nor is there any ground of proof, that in *this respect* at least, the Bournabashi of Chevalier and his followers may not corre-

[1] Dr. Dallaway says "*the most elevated ground* on the edge of a precipice was the Acropolis otherwise called Πέργαμος, (Il. iv. 507. v. 460. xxiv. 700.) Ilium was lofty enough to be called windy, yet it was lower than Pergamus, (xxiv. 700.)" p. 349. See Trans. R. S. Edinb. iv. 71.

spond with the city of Priam. If, indeed, the epithets αἰπὺ and αἰπεινὴ may, like ὑψίπυλον, allude to the loftiness of the walls or towers, the inhabitants of hilly countries will be as little disposed to allow the propriety of the adjunct ἠνεμόεσσα when applied to a city lying in a flat, as the traveller would that of ἀπείρων to the passage of the Dardanelles. What other interpretation shall we likewise assign to ὀφρυόεσσα in its connection with Ἴλιος, (X. 411.) than that of the Scholiast, εἰς ὕψος πεπολισμένη, a meaning not disputed with regard to the ὀφρύα Καλλικολώνη. It does, indeed, seem a very gratuitous assumption that because the city was built in a plain, it was therefore not placed on an eminence. The real distinction, at which Homer seems to aim, is a separation from the root of Mount Ida,[1] or whatever other interpretation may be attached to ὑπώρεια. He does not, however, say, as Mr. Bryant says, (Obs. on Morritt's Vind. p. 54.) that "the city was a great way from Mount Ida." The passage, Ω. 662.

Τηλόθι δ' ὕλη
Ἀξέμεν ἐξ ὄρεος,

may neither have reference to Ida, nor to the position of Troy with regard to any surrounding mountain. It shows only that there was no wood in the immediate neighbourhood of Troy, and that they fetched it from a distant hill.

Neither can any proof of the situation of Troy be derived from the passage so often quoted at Θ. 517. whatever inference may be drawn from it with regard to the meaning of the preposition περί. Allowing this word to express *all around*, it must not be forgotten that the circumstances in which the city was placed, were extraordinary ones.

---

[1] Prof. Heyne says on this subject: "Nec vero Dardania in iisdem locis est quærenda quibus Ilium conditum fuit. Longius enim versus Septentrionem fuit sita. Porro si inhabitarunt homines ὑπωρείας Ἴδης, intelligendum hoc de jugis a vertice remotioribus et ad planitiem littoralis plagæ: nec τὰ κατὰ μέρη τῶν ὀρῶν sunt ipsæ radices aut plane. *Nimium presse* Maro, 'nondum Ilium,' &c. &c. Tandem si Ilium ἐν πεδίῳ fuit conditum, videri debet et hoc non absolute dictum in ipsa planitie campi, sed relate ad antecedens, paullo longius hinc sub radicibus Idæ qua versus plana loca subsidunt juga; unde fit ut epitheta Ilii a montanis locis petita sint." Not. in Il. τ. 216. In his Exc. in Lib. vi. 303. he says, however, "Ilium in radicibus Idæ situm in solo planiore respectu jugorum editiorum montis," and adds, "frustra nostra ætate locus certus urbi et arci quæritur in editissima parte jugi. Saltem contendere licet a Scamandri fontibus muros haud multum abfuisse."

Hector's special and anxious orders upon such an occasion can convey little information as to the customary defence of the city. Apprehensive of a secret attack in the absence of the main army which was at the Throsmos, he gives orders that the boys and old men shall keep watch, *περὶ ἄστυ*, and even the women kindle large fires. Have we lost from sight the frequent assaults of the Precipices of Syracuse, during the Peloponnesian war, or the recent instance of Quebec, that the orders to guard an almost inaccessible part of the city, should appear to admit but one explanation?

Neither does the authority of Virgil in the line, "Ter circum Iliacos raptaverat Hectora muros," appear at all conclusive, or in proof that the city was not on an elevation. He certainly did not believe in the flight of Hector round the walls, and if he thought that under violent feelings of revenge, a man in his chariot might find such a passage, it by no means follows that he believed the city to have been level with the plain. Indeed, so far is Virgil from supposing ancient Troy to have been on a level with the plain, that, notwithstanding many extraordinary assertions to the contrary, he implies exactly the reverse, (Æn. iii. 109.)

Nondum Ilium et Arces
Pergameæ steterant: habitabant vallibus imis.

the latter clause can indicate only a contrast between the former humble, and the present elevated site of Ilium. It is somewhat singular that the intelligent Dr. Vincent should have omitted to notice a circumstance which at once overturns his theory with regard to the different levels on which the city and citadel were placed. While he confesses that no other explanation can be given of *ἠνεμόεσσα*, but "situated on a hill," he places the chief part of the city and the fig-tree on a flat plain, though Homer's only epithet to the *ἐρινεὸς* is also *ἠνεμόεις*.[1] With these conditions we must at least adjudge them a sameness of elevation.

There are other grounds upon which it may be conjectured that the whole of Troy was on an eminence. All Homer's descriptions agree in mentioning an ascent and descent to and from the city. The *Ἴλιον εἰσανάβησαν*, (P. 320. 337.) can have no relation to the walls or towers, as the Trojans themselves are the actors in both instances. The same expression is used at Ω. 700. *Πέργαμον εἰσαναβᾶσα*, where the specific interpretation has never been questioned. When Priam leaves the city to visit Achilles, (Ω. 329.) he descends from the

[1] See also Dalzel's Illustr. of Chevalier, Trans. R. S. Ed. iv.

city into the plain. Οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν πόλιος κατέβαν, πεδίον δ' ἀφίκοντο, and Jupiter, as soon as he saw them descended into the plain, sent Mercury to their assistance. The passage, (Z. 434.) ἔνθα μάλιστα ἄμβατός ἐστι πόλις, καὶ ἐπίδρομον ἔπλετο τεῖχος, seems to me to include a very nice distinction. The ascent to the city is not so great, and the wall is therefore more assailable. The wall itself is, however, not lower here than elsewhere.

The same separation of the city from the plain seems admitted in other places. Antenor (φ. 563.) says, that if Achilles should discover me ἀπαειρόμενον πόλεως πεδίονδε. Admitting, as the only explanation consistent with sense, either that the varia lectio of Eustathius (Ἰδήϊον,) should be adopted, or that the Ἰλήϊον should refer to Ilium, it seems synonymous with the πεδίον Τρωϊκὸν, Τρώων, &c. (Λ. 835, O. 739, Ψ. 464.) though it must also be granted that unless Agamemnon's expression be of a general nature, these must refer to the Throsmus and tomb of Ilus, where the fires were lighted.

In general, the πεδίον Τρωϊκὸν seems to have been that part of the plain which led directly to Troy, (K. 11.) and on the side of the Throsmus: the πεδίον Ἰδήϊον on the side of Ida, the πεδίον Σκαμάνδριον. (B. 465. 67.) on the banks of the Scamander.[1]

Homer has given us no positive information as to the lateral or longitudinal extent of the plain. Besides the space required for the manœuvres of at least 100,000 men, there was ample space for the movements of numerous chariots.[2] We know, moreover, that there

[1] The ἄπαν πεδίον, Υ. 156. Φ. 1. appears to be the space between the ford and ships. Dr. Clarke (ii. 168.) following Demetrius of Scepsis, speaks of another plain, not mentioned by Homer, under the title Simoisian Plain. "Here," he adds, "were signalized all the principal events of the Trojan war." On the site of Troy in general, see Whitaker's Review of Bryant, Brit. Crit. ix. 540. He says: "The lower sides of Ida were inhabited according to Homer, before the Plain below Ida had Troy upon it. Troy, therefore, might be built upon Bournabashi, or any other hill in the plain of Ida, and the learned Bryant has confused himself by confounding the plain of Ida with the plain of Troy. But when he asserts Troy "not to have been even at the bottom of a hill, "to have been even in a plain," he contradicts his author directly." See also particularly Dallaway, cited, Tr. R. E. S. iv. 71.

[2] Captain Franklin has determined with great precision the exact share which would have been occupied by each man, admitting his measurement of the field of battle to be correct, and has concluded, that in a position of three miles long, and half a mile deep, 140,000 men would actually have

were frequently in the rear of the armies vacant spaces to which the wounded retire beyond the reach of the conflict. Chevalier makes the distance from Bournabashi to the naval station twelve or thirteen miles, and to prove the consistency of his account with the circumstances recorded in the Iliad, assumes a point, for which, unfortunately, Homer gives no authority. He affirms that in Priam's visit to Achilles, he set out "early in the afternoon." Now, as we know that he did not arrive at the Ford till night, *νύκτα δι' ἀμβροσίην, ὅτε θ' εὕδουσι βροτοὶ ἄλλοι,* (Ω. 363.) it is not difficult, with the assumed premises, to imagine that he may have passed over a space of twelve or thirteen miles. It is certain that Priam watered his horses and mules at the Ford, but the time which had elapsed from their descent into the plain, does not appear to have been long, for immediately on that event, (*αἶψα* 353.) Jupiter dismisses Mercury, who instantly obeyed, (*αὐτίκ'* 340. 6.) *αἶψα δ' ἄρα Τροίην τε καὶ Ἑλλήσποντον ἵκανε.* He finds them at the Ford.[1]

The great argument against the supposed distance is derived from the events of the celebrated twenty-eighth day. On that day, it is maintained that the armies, amounting to 100,000 men, passed four times over the whole space between the city and the naval station, a supposition wholly irreconcileable with the presumed distance. Admitting, however, the vulgar opinion to be correct, and that only one busy and tumultuous day was intended in the description beginning Λ, and concluding Σ. 240, it does not necessarily follow that the whole army traversed the scene of action four times. Agamemnon fought his way to the city, and came back wounded in his chariot, (Λ. 192. 273.) and Patroclus went also in his chariot to the walls, to return no more. Hector may have passed backwards and forwards in his chariot, but it seems most probable that the larger part of the army never approached the walls. When they were not in the neighbourhood of the ships, we generally find that the Trojans, (a fortiori the Greeks) were fighting at a distance in separate parties, (P. 375.) In the last battle for the body of Patroclus, the fresh Myrmidons, or *ἀριστοι* alone, (P. 368.) seem to have been engaged near the walls,

---

had 38 square yards each for elbow room. He says, however, nothing of chariots and horses.

[1] I omit the common, but unanswerable argument, from the expedition with which the supper for 50,000 men was provided from the city, at the time when the Trojans were encamped on the Throsmos, Κ. 160. Λ. 56. O. 560. &c. far from the city wall, Σ. 255.

while such of them as had before been fighting there, were now engaged on the plain, (P. 371.)

There is, perhaps, no parallel in language to the animating description of the successive events recorded in these eight books. I have, however, scarcely a doubt that Homer himself meant to describe the actions of two, or perhaps three days.[1] The sun seems to set, at least, twice, during the narrative. The scholiast explains, Ἥμος δ' ἠέλιος μετενείσσετο βουλυτόνδε (Π. 779.) by ἐπὶ τὴν ἑσπέραν μετῆλθε. Patroclus is then alive, and engaged in the contest for the body of Cebriones. A most equivocal darkness occurs more than once. While the armies are contending for Sarpedon's body, it is said Ζεὺς δ' ἐπὶ νύκτ' ὀλοὴν τάνυσε, κ. τ. λ. (Π. 567.) The similies have generally a reference to a night action. Menelaus goes in search of Antilochus, and is compared to a lion, who having been watching all night, goes forth in the morning, &c. (P. 660.) When the Grecians fly to the ships, the simile again, (Σ. 162.) contains the word ἄγραυλοι. The darkness during the contest for the body of Patroclus was such, that both sun and moon might be said to have withdrawn their assistance. These circumstances, it is true, supply us only with presumptive evidence in favor of a change of day. There are, however, other points which seem to warrant a more determinate conclusion. Thetis, speaking of the actions of Patroclus and the Myrmidons, declares

---

[1] Prof. Heyne has some interesting observations on this subject, but in agreeing with him I have the good fortune to find that my arguments have not been altogether anticipated by this eminent writer. He observes, "Potest dici Poetam variorum dierum acta, pugnarumque diversarum narrationes, famâ majorum acceptas, in unum diem inclusisse; itaque historiarum fidei detraxisse non ipsis rerum commentis, sed diversorum dierum factis uno die comprehensis. Probabiliora diceres, si discursationem istam utriusque exercitus, per tantum intra urbem et castra intervallum emensos esse nec totos exercitus nec intervallum integrum," &c. also Exc. ii. in xviii. de rebus in pugna tertia, &c. "Dubitationes de fide narrantis, nemini non, si semel ad temporis computum descenderit, occurrunt." Lenz ingeniose in plures dies acta diei dispescuit, &c. ut primus dies finiatur, Lib. xii. extr. castris expugnatis; alter Lib. xvi. 776. sub medium diem pugna Patrocli virtute egregie administratâ; tertius Patrocli corpore in castra reportato, Lib. xvii. 735, 6.

Rennell, however, in contempt of these difficulties says: "The Intervals of time on that day are marked with unusual precision." (121.) My grounds of objection are built less on the impossibility of the transactions than on the very great want of precision in the intervals of time on that day.

that they fought a whole day before the Scæan gates: Πᾶν δ' ἦμαρ μάρναντο περὶ Σκαιῇσι πύλῃσι, (Σ. 453.) and at P. 384, Homer again informs us that they had contended the whole day, παντημερίοις, round the excellent servant of Achilles. It will be equally difficult to reconcile this account with either supposition derived from the seasons specified in the description of the poet. As, however, an insolvable difficulty is connected with the whole account, we are not quite at liberty to ground an objection to the supposed distance from an assumed want of consistence.

The Naval Station. Homer gives us little information as to the situation or extent of the naval station. The fable of the Rhætæan and Sigæan promontories is, comparatively, of modern invention. In the poet no river is described as running through, or as being contiguous to the station.[1] The shore, though wide, (Ξ. 33.) could not contain all the ships, and as the forces were crowded, τῷ ῥα προκρόσσας ἔρυσαν, and filled the long mouth of the whole shore as much as the ἄκραι contained (36.)[2] Mr. Bryant's assertion, (Observ. on Morr. Vind. 31.) that whenever the course of the Scamander could be as-

---

[1] In order to prove the lateral neighbourhood of the river to the Grecian camp, Rennell observes, "The Greeks would not certainly have taken within their camp the course of the great torrent Scamander, so as to hazard a separation of their force by its sudden swelling." (79.) It may, however, be equally contended that, for the same reason, they would not have encamped even in its immediate neighbourhood, especially as we know that it was accustomed to deluge the plain by overflowing its banks.

[2] On this passage Prof. Heyne has furnished a very extraordinary piece of criticism. He observes (Essay on Topog. of Il. and Trans. R. S. Ed. iv. 58.) "When Homer says the ships occupied the whole shore between the two Promontories, he probably meant in a poetical style to convey a magnificent idea, and it is more likely that the camp only stretched on both sides *towards* the Promontories Rhætæum and Sigæum, and that on the North E. it extended to the Simois." Mr. Dalzel follows up this view with his usual enthusiasm. "That the camp was situated betwixt the Sigæan and Rhætæan Promontories is generally agreed, but that it occupied *the whole space* or line of coast in that interval, as Mr. Chevalier has supposed, cannot be admitted. I willingly accede to Prof. Heyne's idea, that the camp only stretched on both sides towards the Rhæt. and Sig. Prom. and that, &c." Now as nothing can possibly be more definite than Homer's description, and as the ships are particularly said to occupy the *whole space* between the two anonymous Promontories, whatever magnificence there may have been in the circumstance, must probably be ascribed rather to the nature of the thing, than to the imagination of the poet.

certained, the left of the ships might also be determined, seems to be founded upon a mistaken interpretation of the passage, Λ. 524. It is true that Hector was fighting near the Scamander, ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ μάχης, but it is also certain without the necessity for any hidden meaning, that if Achilles was on the right of the Greeks, Hector was also on that side, and therefore on the left as it respected the Trojan battle, for Machaon being wounded in that quarter, passed near Achilles in his way to Nestor's ship. (Λ. 614.)[1]

Of the extent of the στόμα equally mistaken opinions have been maintained. While some Commentators have considered the Rhætæan and Sigæan promontories as the only boundaries, others have confined the space within very narrow limits. The premises of both parties are generally inadmissible. Homer certainly does not say that Agamemnon's voice was heard at the two extremities from the centre ship, any more than he specifies by name the two Promontories. The scholiast explains γεγωνέμεν (Θ. 223. Λ. 5.) by βοᾶν, and judiciously remarks that Agamemnon took his purple robes with him in order that he might be seen by the Greeks, who, in consequence of the surrounding clamor, would not be able to hear him. That it does not mean exaudiri appears from its subsequent use, (Θ. 227.) Δαναοῖσι γεγωνώς. Hector was, indeed, probably at the centre of the ships, and, not, as is generally asserted even by the most learned critics,[2] on the side of the Rhætæan Promontory when Achilles

---

[1] What confusion has arisen from the various and contradictory views which have been taken of the passages here cited! Prof. Heyne decides that the left always means the Grecian left, and puzzles himself extremely. "Hector in læva parte pugnabat, ὄχθας πὰρ ποταμοῖο Σκαμάνδρου, xi. 498, 9. Unde colligas Tumulum Ili Simoenti propiorem fuisse, (806.) Sunt alia loca e quibus suspiceris ad Scamandri alveum versus superiora fuisse, &c. Omnino hic Ili tumulus plurimas molestias facit incerto situ." (Suppl. et emend. Lib. vi. p. 720.)

Rennell supposes a poetic fiction in Nestor's carrying Machaon wounded from the *left of the field*, past the tent of Achilles *on the right*, in his way to the centre. He adds, "there may have been reasons for making this detour, though they do not appear in the poem." 27, note. I can find no detour.

[2] Heyne on the same subject remarks, "quæ forma loci, qu antum spatium fuerit quod et naves et copiæ occuparent, poeta nunquam satis diserte apposuit, (Exc. i. in Lib. vii.) Certe intervallum ab uno cornu castrorum ad alterum non nimis magnum fuisse arguunt nonnulla quæ sigillatim memorantur; v. c. quod Achilles qui *dextram* tenebat, audit Hectorem vociferantem *ad sinistram*, xvi. 77. In dextro cornu Achillem tetendisse, *lævas partes* Ajacem tenuisse satis constat vel ex Il. xi. 78. &c. Ajacem non

heard his voice, (Π. 76.) and saw the fires kindled. (127.) As we know very little of the real signification of the term *πρόκροσσας*, we cannot with certainty determine the exact form and position of the ships. In Homer *κρόσσα* does not seem to be a scaling ladder as it is usually interpreted. If at M. 258. we find *κρόσσας πύργων καὶ ἐπάλξεις*, we can scarcely allow it to have a distinct meaning at M. 443. *κροσσάων ἐπιβαίνεμεν*. It seems to be a part of the word, and therefore to be used indifferently and in common with *πύργος*, (430.) which also of itself conveys the whole meaning. Though, therefore, we may admit that the ships were placed in rows and on different elevations, the shape in which they were actually ranged, a main object in the elucidation of many subsequent passages, and in determining the figure of the shore, cannot be ascertained. That the coast was steep appears from many places, (Ξ. 28. N. 682.) The ships which first arrived were drawn up into the plain, and these were *νῆες ἄκραι*, extreme or highest, (O. 653.) Among these appear to have been the ships of Ajax and Protesilaus. The latter warrior first landed (B. 702.) of all the Greeks, and his ship (as being in the front

---

in ultimis sed in primis ordinibus ad ipsum vallum stationem habuisse multis locis apparet," i. in vii. 39. Ajax, says the same author, (Topography of Troy,) was stationed towards Rhætæum, consequently, on the left wing of the camp; Achilles with his Myrmidons on the right towards Sigæum. In regard to the two extremities there is no doubt. In the midst of a vast deal of confusion, the Professor has, however, afforded some glimmerings of a more precise meaning. See p. 102. "Perhaps on the north," to "enemy's attack," and 105, "the fortification seems" to "know not how to explain." Indeed he acknowledges that he cannot explain any part of the passage relating to the ships, Z. 30. &c. The place N. 674, 5, 9. 82. is, he observes, "of considerable difficulty in respect of the topography." He is again embarrassed, (684) by the expressions *αὐτοί τε καὶ ἵπποι*, and asks, "How could chariots be of any use in the narrow space between the ships and the Rampart?" (Essay, 107.) Surely this space could not be small if in his opinion the *Θρῳσμὸς* and *τύμβος ἀκριτος* were the same. Though this probably could not be the fact, yet we know from numberless places in Homer, that there was ample space for the movements of chariots. See, close by the Ships, M. 110, &c. Π. 344. 67. 70. 80. O. 259. 354. 384. It is to be regretted that so many real difficulties should be artificially increased by Prof. Heyne's general unwillingness to concede his preconceived opinions even to the authority of Homer himself. He says, indeed, (Exc. I. in VII.) "Intervallo satis magno abfuisse a vallo naves ex eo patet quod hoc loco inter Trojanos, &c. et Achivos pugnatum est," and it will appear from many citations made for my present purpose, that this distinguished author was very frequently inconsistent with himself.

line) was first seized by Hector. The position of these vessels of Ajax and Protesilaus (which were together) cannot well be determined from Homer. They were not at the Rhætæan Promontory, or on the left of the ships, as is usually supposed, because all Hector's achievements, and the burning of the ship of Protesilaus is, to all appearance, in the centre of the battle. In the assault (M. 85, &c.) by the five divisions of the Trojan army, Asius Hyrtacides alone goes to the left of the ships, where the gates were open to admit the entrance of the fugitive Greeks. The remaining parties assault the other gates. (M. 175.) The largest number and the bravest young men followed Hector and Polydamas eager to make a breach in the wall, and to burn the ships. (198.) The Ajaces at that moment were at no one particular spot, *πάντοσε φοιτήην, μένος ὀτρύνοντες Ἀχαιῶν.* (266.) As soon as Hector has burst open the gates (437) Ajax is opposed to him, and Idomeneus, knowing that the central attack by Hector is sufficiently opposed by the Ajaces and Teucer, goes to the left of the ships which is unprotected. (N. 309.) Homer no where intimates that the ships of Ajax were in this quarter. At this side Asius Hyrtacides is afterwards killed. We learn moreover, (674) that during the whole past action, Hector had been ignorant of the events which had occurred on the left, and still continued to fight where he first broke open the gates, and ascended the wall, in the spot where the ships of Ajax and Protesilaus were drawn up on the shore, (681.) above which the wall was lowest, and where, though the bravest of the army were posted, (684.) they could not repel his furious attack. (688.) From this central point he goes, by advice of Polydamas, to the left of the ships, in search of Asius Hyrtacides, (759-65.) He returns with Paris to Polydamas and Cebriones, who were left in the centre, and is wounded by Ajax (Ξ. 418.) He joins the battle, (O. 270.) and the Greeks fly through the wall, (345.) Apollo makes a bridge across the Foss, and the Trojans are enabled to drive their chariots, *κατὰ τεῖχος*, (384.) not through the gates, and therefore probably through the breach. They fight close to the ships, (385.) Hector and Ajax contend for one ship, (415-16.) The Grecians retreat from the first line of ships, (656.) but Ajax still continues on the deck, and defends the ship of Protesilaus. Hector having once seized upon this, (716) never quits his hold till it is in flames, (Π. 127.) It does not seem possible that the station of Hector can have been at or near the Rhætæan Promontory. Neither could his ships and those of Protesilaus have been, even as Homer may seem to say, close upon the sea. When Ajax is left alone to

defend the ship of Protesilaus, the Grecians had made a retreat behind them to their tents. Here the θῖν' ἐφ' ἁλὸς πολιῆς, appears only to have a general allusion. In another passage it has, however, a precise meaning; when the fight was at the νῆες ἄκραι. The ships of Tydides, Ulysses and Agamemnon were on the shore of the sea, at a great distance from the scene of action, (Ξ. 31.) at such a distance, and in such a position, that they could see nothing that was going on.

We learn from Homer that the ships of Achilles and Ajax were on each side, at the farthest point from the ship of Ulysses, which centre ship was close upon the shore. In the embassy to Achilles, Ajax and Ulysses reach his ships by keeping along the coast of the sea. It is not improbable that by the sentence τοὶ ῥ' ἔσχατα νῆας ἐΐσας εἵρυσαν, Homer meant to convey the idea of a station in some respect unprotected by, or detached from the rest of the fleet.[1] The post both of Ajax and Achilles was chosen before the wall of defence was erected, and there seems to have been no more occasion for the valor of these heroes at their supposed extreme point, than for that of any of the troops which were stationed directly opposite the Trojan plain and the most probable side of attack.[2] It appears indeed, as if they must have been most secure on the flanks of the ships. There must, however, have been some great peculiarity in their situation, which has never suggested itself to any commentator, in order that Homer should ascribe to their reliance on their valor and strength the choice of so hazardous a post. We know that the station of Achilles was not closely connected with the main fleet, as after their unsuccessful embassy, Ulysses and Ajax are said to return to the ships, παρὰ νῆας ἴσαν πάλιν. Now as the council was holding in one ship only, the expression could have no reference to this single ship, (I. 653.) and at Λ. 804, Patroclus went beyond the

[1] Odys. Z. 205. Ἔσχατοι, οὐδέ τις ἄμμι βροτῶν ἐπιμίσγεται ἄλλος.

[2] Heyne very curiously remarks on this subject, "Porro tenendum est non tota Achæorum castra vallo circumdata fuisse, nam latus dextrum quod Achilles tenebat vallo non fuit inclusum: dubito quoque de extremo latere sinistro, quæ Ajacis fuit statio. Sed *media tantum pars* intra Ajacis et Achillis stationes, qua Trojanorum aditus et impetus *maxime erant metuendi*, &c." Exc. i. in vii. This would reverse Homer's view of the affair. Before the wall was built, the two extremes had been chosen by Ajax and Achilles, as the most dangerous positions. I may remark here that the security afforded to Ajax by his supposed neighbour, the torrent Scamander, argues either against that neighbourhood, or his danger.

ships, παρὰ νῆας, to Achilles, and in his road from the ship of Nestor, passed the centre ship of Ulysses. (A. 805.) At A. 349. the Heralds also return from Achilles to the ships of the Achæans. (327. 306.) The ship of Nestor was clearly more than half way from the ships of Achilles to the supposed position of Ajax. At K. 113 we find, however, that the ships of Ajax and Idomeneus were still far off from the ship of Nestor.

If Ἔσχατα mean the farthest points, it by no means follows that one of these points may not have been towards land, and on the plain, and if we admit that the θῖν' ἐφ' ἁλὸς πολιῆς may comprehend the shore at large, we shall not find much contradiction in this new view of Ajax's position.

The Rampart, &c. Near the Τύμβος ἄκριτος ἐκ πεδίου (H. 435.) the Greeks built a wall and lofty towers, as a defence to themselves and the ships. They made gateways for the passage of their chariots, and on the outside sunk a wide Foss. (441.) The wall was built at the stern of the ships (ἐπὶ πρύμνησιν) which were drawn up into the plain, (Ξ. 31.) and was lowest opposite or above the ships of Ajax and Protesilaus, (N. 681.) where the bravest troops were stationed. This exposed situation in front might warrant Homer's commendation of Ajax, and the detached position of Achilles might also entitle him to praise which may otherwise appear unmerited. Mr. Bryant (Observ. on Morritt, p. 18.) remarks that Homer has specified no precise time during which the Grecians were occupied in constructing the wall, and sinking the foss, and that it is quite an error to suppose that the poet assigned only a single day to this operation. From the extent and magnitude of the work, he is of opinion that it must have occupied a considerable space of time, and, therefore, that the truce was of an indefinite length.[1] There is, however, much less authority in Homer for any extension of time upon this occasion, than on the celebrated 28th day, which Mr. Bryant is not disposed to protract beyond its usual number of hours. He sets out, indeed, with the gratuitous assumption, that as soon as the Truce was concluded, the Trojans went to Ida to cut wood, and that the Grecians went to the same distance on the same errand. Though they certainly went to Ida to cut down oak for the Pyre of Patroclus, it does not follow that at this early period the Grecians had not wood in their own immediate neighbourhood.[2] The fires required for 120,000 men, to make

[1] Dares Phrygius may have supplied Mr. Bryant with his ideas on the subject of Truces. See passim.

[2] Pope with his usual want of precision descends to the shore for wood,

no mention of other specified purposes as palisades, gates, &c. might in a few days consume a very large stock of such materials, and all that Homer says upon the occasion in reference to either party, is ἕτεροι δὲ μεθ' ὕλην. We learn that immediately on the conclusion of the Truce, the Trojans and Grecians commenced their labours. The sun had just risen (H. 421.) the day, and probably part of the night, was spent in consuming the bodies, and having performed this duty, the Grecians returned to their ships. Before it was quite day-light —while light was yet doubtful, Ἦμος δ' οὔτ' ἄρ πω ἠὼς, ἔτι δ' ἀμφιλύκη νὺξ, a select band of Achæans made a barrow on the plain to contain the ashes of their companions. Near this they erected their wall and towers, sunk a wide foss, and defended it with palisades, and completed their work at sunset, Δύσετο δ' ἠέλιος, τετέλεστο δὲ ἔργον Ἀχαιῶν. We cannot easily admit that this period was more than an entire day, and it may be remarked that the only difficulty of importance connected with this operation, the indifference of the Trojans to its progress, becomes much more inexplicable under Mr. Bryant's hypothesis.

Professor Heyne seems to puzzle himself very unnecessarily on the subject of the wall, to which, indeed, he very unwillingly gives the name assigned it by Homer, τεῖχος. "Besides it," he says, "a rampart is constructed which the poet terms a wall." (Essay 102. 5.) At xvi. 396. 7. (he observes) occurs the remarkable expression μεσηγὺ νηῶν, καὶ ποταμοῦ καὶ τείχεος ὑψηλοῖο, betwixt the ships, the river, and *the town*. When Patroclus drives the Trojans finally from the camp, he cuts off the retreat of a part of the fugitives to the city, forces them back towards the camp, and falls on them betwixt the station of the ships, the river, and *the city*. Here it is difficult to form a distinct idea of the topographical situation, unless we understand it thus: first, between the ships and the river, then further on between the river and *the town*. I would ask what occasion there is for all this

(vii. 491.) and Bryant himself, p. 12. says: "there must have been an ample forest at the Throsmos to have afforded such convenience so soon."

I cannot help observing in this place how completely inadequate to all the purposes of nicer enquiry, is the translation of Pope, who is full of original error, and unacknowledged obligation to his predecessors. Wakefield, who does justice to the Poet, has industriously exposed the numerous faults and plagiarisms of the Translator, who becomes less tolerable upon every renewed acquaintance with Homer. The work of Cowper, however liable to the objection of asperity, is a valuable addition to the literature of the country.

difficulty, or rather why is any mention made of the town or city? Because Prof. Heyne despised the lofty wall or rampart of the Greeks, a proof of the insignificance of which he draws from the fact, that "Sarpedon seized with his hand the battlements of the breastwork." The value of this proof must evidently depend upon the meaning of the word ἔπαλξις, which may possibly have been extended downwards, and when itself destroyed, have exposed the wall above, in the manner described by Homer. But would not the same argument apply against the propriety of the adjunct ὑψηλὸς, when connected with the city or town wall itself? Patroclus three times ascended it without difficulty, and, but for the intervention of Apollo, would have entered the town by this road, by this τείχεος ὑψηλοῖο, Π. 702. We know in general that the πύργους of the Grecian wall were lofty, (ὑψηλοὺς) and that the wall itself was μέγα. (H. 388. 463. M. 257.) But how did it happen that the learned Professor overlooked the τείχεος ὑψηλοῖο, Π. 512. M. 388. which is this very insignificant rampart of the Greeks, and not the wall of Troy? The discovery of this passage would have saved an infinite deal of trouble and anxiety.

We cannot collect from any part of Homer's narrative from which side the rampart extended.[1] We have nothing to lead us to the situation of the τύμβος ἄκριτος, nor to the exact relation intended by προτὶ αὐτόν. This want of precision leads of course to an infinite expense of critical labor, and to directly opposite results from those on whose judgments we are most disposed to rely. As the objects themselves are, however, of so little importance as never again to occupy the Poet's attention, there is no reason why we should further examine the sources of a discrepancy which can occasion no practical inconvenience.

[*To be continued.*]

[1] "The position of the τύμβος ἄκριτος must have been on the left wing, (says Prof. Heyne, Top. of Troy) to which it must have served for a protection. But as the river Simois ran on the same side, it is not clear what was the position of the Mound in relation to the River, and what was the situation of the left wing, and particularly what was the position of the ships, and of the post of Ajax with respect to both. *In the assault of the camp which took place on this wing*, no mention is made either of this river or the mound." See also Exc. i. in vii. Heyne agrees with Bryant as to the time occupied in the construction of the Rampart, &c. on the ground, however, that it could not have been completed in the time assigned. "Non facile hæc omnia die 23, 24. perpetrata ad unum diem revocari possunt," &c. &c. Exc. i. in xviii. All this cannot be easily settled unless we knew of what number the select band consisted. A few thousand men may effect a great deal in a very short space of time.

MOHAMMEDES.

Carmen Præmio dignatum in Coll. Æd. Chr. Oxon.
1787.

Sed tu qui tandem, quibus aut venisti ab oris,
Quove tenes iter?

Qua patet in pontum latè porrecta Erythræum
Ægyptum Syriamque inter, ditissima tellus,
Sævus Arabs sedes atque effera regna locavit:
Tempore quo primum Ishmaëlem duræ ira novercæ
Finibus ejecit patriis, longeque coëgit
Ignotas terras, alienaque quærere regna.
Jam tum nascentem populum fovisse Jehovah
Creditur haud dubiis signis, et Marte feroces
Inspirasse animos, aptasque ad prælia vires,
Scilicet ut duris utcumque exercita bellis
Aspera gens, spoliis assueta, et vivere rapto
Pelleret irrumpentem hostem, ferroque paratum
Assereret sibi regnum, et ductum in sæcula nomen.
Hinc Arabes bello egregii, qui impunè per agros
Effusi vitam non ullâ lege trahebant,
Necdum soliciti rerum cognoscere causas
Aut spumantis equi luctantia flectere colla,
Aut celeri inter se cursu certare solebant;
Ille adeo donec Nabatheæ gloria gentis
Sensim emollivit populum Mahumeda ferocem,
Atque novâ cœpit sub religione tueri.
Ille sacras ausus Christi subvertere leges,
Ipsius et demens jussus simulare Jehovæ.
Quo nato, solitas testantur Tigridis undam
Visam indignari ripas, portisque revulsis
Persarum fama est tremuisse palatia regis.
Quem tandem ut matura virum confecerat ætas,
Jutritos perhibent nemorum exquisisse recessus,
Et visus hominum et sociæ commercia vitæ
Adversatum, Haræ longum latuisse latebris.
Sic instaurati Romæ nascentia regna
Jam bellis vexata nimis sub rege Quirino,
Numæ in Aricinos placuit secedere saltus,
Et sæpe Ejeriæ præcepta haurire canentis
Surgentis famam imperii, sortesque futuras,
Hinc Mohammedes simulati numine Divi
Afflatus magnos animo meditarier ausus,
Multivagos Arabum assuescit rescindere cultus,
Et primum Meccæ insolitos inducere ritus.
Legibus impositis si quis parere recuset,
Continuo læsi tristas denunciat iras

Numinis, et pœnas Erebi, et loca fœda minatur
Quà sitis ægra urit, quàque implacabilis æstus
Et tremulos artus depascit torrida pestis.
Quin contra fidei servatæ præmia ponit,
Otia, et exemptum curis gravioribus ævum.
Defunctos vitâ lautis accumbere mensis,
Et molli amplexu faciles in vota puellas
Excipere, et formæ illecebras errare per omnes
Infixis oculis, et corda explere tuendo:
Mille illis blandi vultuque habituque lepores,
Regia majestas qualis solet esse Dearum,
Et qui luxuriant late per colla fluentes
Ambrosii crines æternaque in ore Juventas.
Scilicet his una festas agitare choreas
Concentusque inter volucrum viridante sub umbrâ
Carpere perpetuæ varia oblectamina vitæ.
Non alia hospitibus præbebat pocula Circe
Littore in Ausonio—hic simulatâ mente Propheta
Nec jam duram adhibet vim, incertave prælia miscet.
Mox vero postquam in partem est data Mecca Medinis,
Ceu leo detentus laqueis et fraude plagarum
Assiduo tandem morsu si vincula rupit
Emissus late furit, et per ovilia turbans
Hic illic strages et tristia funera spargit.
Non aliter Mahumeda instructo milite cinctus
Torquet bellum ingens, illum jam infanda furentem
Ut videre, retro passim cessere cohortes
Romanæ, turpemque fugâ petiere salutem—
Quem vero Latiæ et Syriæ collecta juventus
Non ausa est contra duris concurrere in armis,
Eu! medios inter mors immatura triumphos
Abstulit, atque interruptos abrupit honores.
Non illi, ut decuit, confosso vulnere honesto
Contigit oppetere, aut certo succumbere morbo,
Fœmineis domito insidiis, et tabe veneni.
His ex principiis, atque hac ab origine crevit
Religio, quæ mox insana sub arma coëgit
Extremas hominum semota ad littora gentes,
Quippe suos vates docuit per tela per ignes
Victores superesse, aut pulchræ occumbere morti—
Sæpe ergo miles delusus vulnere in ipso,
Aut desiderio nympharum accensus insani,
Quas Mahumeda offert perfunctis munere vitæ,
Exhalantem animam spoliorum pascit amore.
Jam dicam Syriæ victas longo ordine gentes,
Et domitam Ægyptum, et fœdo polluta cruore
Oppida Persarum, quot belli fulmen Omarus
Seu quot stravit Ali, haud illos angusta viarum
Vallorumque minæ, aut acies clypeata virorum

Impediunt; jam Bostra brevi obsidione tenetur,
Jam superata ruit, nec tu, veneranda Damascus,
Centum excelsa licet vastas amplecteris arces,
Barbaricam pellis rabiem, sed diruta latè
Bis gemis innocuos cives sævo impete captos.
Ipsa etiam sacræ nutant juga celsa Sionis
Imbelli dextrâ defensa, et inertibus armis.
Solvitur in luxum nempe atque ignobilis oti
Gaudia, in Eoo memorandus Heraclius orbi,
Qui captos olim traxisse in vincula Persas,
Claraque ab Assacidis toties retulisse trophæa
Dicitur, et sorte et felicibus inclytus annis.
Sed quid adhuc memorem procerum civilia bella
Fortunasque Arabum versas, et volventibus annis
Disjuncta imperia, et surgentem in prælia Turcam?
Quum linquens Scythiæ assiduis juga cana pruinis
Impuni aspersit Graiorum sanguine campos
Byzanti tandem captâ dominatus in urbe.
Atqui olim, ni vana fides, venientibus annis
Tempus erit, quum res Arabum melioribus ibunt
Auspiciis, falsi reteget mendacia vatis
Quum pater Omnipotens, et clarâ in luce patebit,
Non secus ac spissâ dudum sol conditus umbrâ
Aureus exsurgit quando, et caligine pulsâ
Lætius aspersit renovato lumine cœlum.
Tum purgata Arabum meliori incedet amictu
Religio, discetque novo mitescere cultu.
Gens effræna diu densisque immersa tenebris
In lucem exsurget, rigidique insignia Martis
Depulsus, ritusque omnes exuta profanos
Te Christe atque tuas tandem venerabitur aras.

JOHN BURROWS.

ON THE DERIVATION OF *Antea, Antehac, Postea, Posthac, Postilla, Posteaquam, Interea, &c.*

In these and similar words the terminating particles, *Ea*, *hac*, and *illa* have been by grammarians and lexicographers uniformly held to be accusatives plural under the government of the preposition with which they are compounded. At first view, indeed, this mode of formation appears perfectly natural, and such as to account not unaptly for the application of these terms, as they are actually employed in the ordi-

nary practice of the language. When, however, we examine them more narrowly, we meet with difficulties irreconcileable with such a history of their origin, and which no ingenuity seems able to remove. Of these, one, not of inconsiderable magnitude, though little obvious to the hasty observer, may be found in the early form of certain of the words themselves; another, more readily noticed, arises from the quantity of the final *a* in such of them as end in that letter, which, contrary to the constant practice in the accusative plural neuter, is always long. Thus it is universally admitted that *Antea* in Hor. Epod. II. 1. has the final *a* long; *Postea* occurs in no poet of any note; *Postilla* has the long final *a* in a line of unquestionable authority from Catullus, Carm. 84. v. 9. Edit. Doeringii;[1] *Interea* and *Præterea* with the *a* long are too familiar to the classical reader to require particular notice. It may probably be argued, that the change of quantity in their adverbial form, militates not against the derivation usually assigned them; that the liberty assumed by the ancients of removing these words from that grammatical class to which they properly belong, and employing them as adverbs, might with equal propriety extend itself to the quantity also; and that to distinguish the adverb

---

[1] Facciolati and Gesner concur in assigning the long quantity to the final *a* in *postea*, and, what shews the attention they had given to the subject, they both do so, not by the mark of a long quantity merely, but by a particular notice. Thus Facciolati, postea *videtur ultimam produxisse, Plaut. Pœn.* i. 1. 19. *quoties apud poetas (excipio comicos) reperies (quod perraro fiet) rectius* post ea *divisum scribes; nam conjunctum languet. Sic, apud Ovid. Fast.* i. 165. Post ea *mirabar, &c.* and so indeed it is printed by Gierig, and probably by Burman, to whose edition I have not at present access. *Post ea,* here marking simply the succession of events, without an immediate reference to time, is the only correct reading, and obviously the only reading that the meaning of the passage can admit. Gesner says decidedly, and truly, *ultima longa est; nisi divise altera pars pro pronomine habeatur, ut,* post ea *mirabar, &c.* Ovid. Fast. i. 165. Post ea *præteriit, &c.* Ovid. Fast. 2. 555. Notwithstanding these remarks, however, the same learned critics, without adducing one argument or authority in support of their opinion, give this same *a* the mark of a short quantity in the compound posteaquam. Smetius indeed quotes it so from Victorinus, whose authority can hardly be esteemed of sufficient weight to overthrow that of the more ancient writers; but even were his authority such as could not be challenged, we would still maintain that the final *a* of *postea* is long, and reconcile every difficulty by the figure Synecphonesis. By having recourse to this, instead of a quadrisyllable we would make *posteaquam* a word of three syllables only; and this I believe to be really the pronunciation intended by Victorinus.

from the words of which it is composed, when at any time it happened to be requisite to use them in their separate and proper sense, no more simple expedient could be resorted to than this slight change upon their native quantity. This opinion undoubtedly merits the praise of ingenuity; but the facts and arguments which are to be afterwards adduced seem abundantly decisive of its inaccuracy. In regard to *Interea* and *Præterea*, it may perhaps be said, that the necessity for their frequent employment in Hexameter verse was of itself an argument sufficiently powerful to induce the Poet to adapt them to his line by giving them a quantity which originally did not belong to them: or, that the cesural syllable which they leave after affording a complete dactyl, it has always been the Poet's province to elongate at pleasure. Certain it is, no doubt, that the Poets assumed, and by the courtesy of their countrymen were permitted to take considerable liberties in this respect; but if this doctrine be well founded, the acquisition of *Interea*, *Præterea*, &c. was more than counterbalanced by the loss of *Postea*, *Antea*, &c. which, by this arrangement, if it is to be considered one of accommodation merely, were entirely, and not very wisely excluded from this species of verse.

The doubts to which these difficulties gave rise, led to the investigations detailed in the subsequent pages of this paper; and though the conclusion drawn by the author may be questioned; and, perhaps, overthrown by the researches of an abler enquirer, he will not be displeased to see the fallacy of his opinion detected on principles more solid than those which he here ventures to advance. If on the other hand the opinions here stated shall appear to be well founded, the quantity of one word of the series, *Posteaquam*, has been inaccurately given by many eminent critics, and their authority inconsiderately and implicitly followed in some of the most celebrated seminaries of which the kingdom can boast.

In this discussion the first point that demands examination is, whether, in the ordinary use of the language, we discover any distinction betwixt *Post* considered adverbially [1] and *Postea*; and in what that difference, if there appear to be any in their application, must be held to consist. This, if ascertained, may lead us to the true solution of the question, whether the terminating pronoun in these compounds shall still continue in possession of the rank of an accusative

[1] It is unnecessary here to discuss the question whether *post* is ever denuded of its governing power as a preposition, and we call it an adverb, merely in compliance with the loose practice of grammarians.

plural, so long assigned it by the concurring voice of critics and grammarians, or if it be still necessary to attempt the discovery of another origin more consonant to the principles of this distinction, and better calculated to explain every peculiarity of quantity and signification which these adverbs are known to exhibit.

In attempting, then, to ascertain the distinction observed by the Romans in the application of these two words, we may remark, that if a specific number of hours, days, months, or years is mentioned, the ablatives *horis*, *diebus*, *mensibus*, and *annis* are almost uniformly associated with *Post* and *Ante*, and seldom, if ever, with *Postea* and *Antea*. The same observation is applicable to what are denominated adverbs in *o*, as, *paulo*, *multo*, *aliquanto*, [1] which are obviously ablatives singular of adjectives, and to which, if we would complete their construction, and convey a perfect idea of their meaning, the substantive *tempore* must necessarily be supplied.[2]

---

[1] Jungitur *(post)* cum aliis adverbiis in *o* desinentibus. Facciol. sub. Voc. *post.*

[2] Thus the Romans did not say *tertio post die*, Liv. 23. 46. but *postea*; not *venerat antea*, but *venerat multo ante*; not *post non multo ad exercitum venit*, but *postea domum rediit*. To multiply examples of this construction, which must be familiar to every observer, is wholly unnecessary. The instances which seem to controvert this doctrine are so few as to render it a subject worthy of the critic's enquiry, whether, in the passages where they do occur, they are not attributable to corruptions of the text, rather than fluctuation in the practice of the ancients. Facciolati, for instance, quotes a passage from Cicero, which as given by him, and in many editions of that author, appears at first sight to subvert the distinction now attempted to be drawn betwixt *post* and *postea*, but which, when more maturely considered, will be found to be palpably absurd, and wholly unintelligible. The words as quoted by Facciolati are, *Neque enim sunt aut obscura, aut non multo postea commissa.* In Cat. 1. 6. The word *multo* in this passage ought to be *multa*. The same sentence is quoted under *post*, by Gesner who reads *multo post*, which though consistent with the usual construction of the phrase, and grammatically correct, is logically false, and wide of Cicero's meaning. I am not however prepared to maintain that the Romans never lost sight of the proper and original meaning of these words, or that every expression which they have left us is so very perfect as to defy the attacks of the critic, the grammarian, and the etymologist. The most correct of our English authors, whose grammatical precision may be rated equal to that of the ancients themselves, are said to be guilty of occasional aberrations from purity, and hardly secure from the prying scrutiny of the fastidious grammarian; and we can see no reason why the ancients should be exempted from the general charge of incidental

So regular indeed is the recurrence of this construction, and to such difficulties have grammarians been reduced in attempting to account for it, that many of them have been led to the singular conclusion that *Ante* and *Post* sometimes govern an ablative case. The falsity of this doctrine will be developed in the progress of the paper, and the evidence, that in such constructions a word, or clause of a sentence, is omitted, will illustrate and establish the only legitimate government of these prepositions. But we proceed with our distinction betwixt *Post* and *Postea*, &c. As *Ante* and *Post* have been stated to be the proper words, when a specified time is mentioned after or before which an event is represented as having occurred, so *Antea*, *Postea* &c. are seldom, perhaps never, correctly associated with the number of days, months, years, or any of those terms that serve to denote the ordinary divisions of time. Hence by comparing the construction about which there is no dispute, namely, the expression of a determinate portion of time by means of *Post* and an ablative, with the doubtful case which, to represent an undefined time, forms the termination of *Postea*, we can hardly refuse our assent to the analogical inference thence deduced, that this *Ea* subjoined to *Post* holds precisely the place of such words as *annis*, *mensibus*, &c. in the more definite mode of announcing the time, and that it ought, as much as these, to be accounted strictly and originally an ablative case.[1]

Such then being the ordinary application of these terms, as they are actually employed in the language, which in the present state of the argument is all that it is necessary to contend for, I now proceed

---

oversight. If, however, as there is reason to believe in a hundred instances, ninety-nine are found to confirm the distinction stated, on the uniformity of this practice we may safely rely as a powerful argument in proof of that derivation for which we contend.

[1] The remarks that are applicable to *post* and *postea*, *ante* and *antea*, are also to be extended to *postquam* and *posteaquam*, with this exception, however, in regard to *postquam*, that it seems to hold a generic rank, and to be used equally, whether a precise and specified time be expressed or not; whilst *posteaquam* may be affirmed never to accompany the words *anno*, *annis*, *mense*, *mensibus*, &c. Thus in the expression, *Hannibal, tertio anno postquam domo profugerat*, Nep. 23. 8. *posteaquam* is inadmissible; but leave out the words *tertio anno*, and *Hannibal, posteaquam domo profugerat*, becomes unexceptionable. *Idem ille populus, posteaquam majus imperium est nactus——trecentas statuas Demetrio Phalereo decrevit*. Id. 1. 6. On the principles stated *posteaquam* in this sentence is correctly employed.

to prove from their early history, so far as it is known to us, and from the forms under which they appear in the ancient records of the language, that the compounding pronouns *Ea* and *Hac* can be nothing but ablatives.

The form of these words which first claims attention is that in which the pronoun *Id* appears inserted betwixt the preposition, and the terminating particles *Ea* and *Hac*. Hence we have the words *Antidea* (or *Anteidea,*) *Postidea, Antidhac,*[1] forms familiar to all who are conversant with Plautus, and the fragments of the oldest Roman Authors. In the more early stages of the formation of a language, words are never idly introduced, and the expedients employed for the enunciation of thought in such circumstances have been too often carelessly set aside as undeserving of attention, or *satisfactorily* darkened by the learned obscurity of a technical expression. Hence in accounting for the middle portion of the compounds *Antidea,* &c. it has been accounted sufficiently illustrative of its force and origin, by an application of the term equally fertile and fallacious, to ascribe it to euphony; and critics, willingly and easily betrayed by the magic of a learned term, have never dreamt of extending the range of their enquiries. To philologists of this easy temper it seems never to have occurred that such words as these form a beautiful and interesting link in the chain that connects the present with the past, that closely unites the abridged and airy form of a highly cultivated language with the artless rudeness of that primitive structure which is so amply displayed in the homely exuberance of a fresh and uncorrupted speech. By these words, it is conceived, the ordinary course of abbreviating language is conspicuously marked in two of its stages. In the one, it is arrested for our contemplation in the middle of its career; in the other, it is carried down to that point which circumstances in the literary history of the people have for ever determined

---

[1] *Antidea* occurs in the antiquated formula of a public vow recorded by Livy, 22. 10. *Si antidea senatus populusque jusserit fieri, ac faxit, eo populus solutus, liber esto.* Edit. Ruperti, Gott. 1807. *postidea* is frequently met with in Plautus,

Postidea ego tota tecum mea voluptas usque ero
Assiduo. Truc. 2. 4. 67. Edit. Gronov.

Antidhac,

Cui in re tuli jam subvenisti antidhac. Id. Aul. 2. 8. 26.

Interidea seems also to have been used, vid. Auson. Popma de Usu Antiq. Locut. Lib. 1. cap. 6.

to be the farthest removed from the original state that can possibly take place. The form *Antidea*, itself seemingly the bare representative of an expression much more ample, which, in the course of ordinary conversation, seems gradually to have lost certain of its component portions, was in its turn superceded by the still more abbreviated *Antea*, which the confirmed establishment and perfection of the language towards the expiration of the republic has served to perpetuate. *Antidea* is no contrivance of the Poet to eke out a halting verse; it is recorded by Livy himself among the terms of a public deed. The archives of every country attest, that in the formal style of public writings the rude purity of speech is more perfectly preserved than in any literary monuments whatever: in them, it survives longest the effects of that progressive change which the language of every advancing people is destined to undergo. In this singular document, accordingly, the *Antea* of later times appears distinctly composed of the three words, *Ante*, *Id* and *Ea*, and these, if properly analysed, may also lead us to the conclusion, that the terminating *Ea* of *Antea*, and consequently of the other similarly compounded Adverbs, is an Ablative case.

In *Antidea*, then, the use of *Id* seems to be to recal, as if by recapitulation, and bring cursorily under the review of the mind, a fact, or event previously mentioned, whilst *Ante* carries us back to a period of time antecedent to that in which the fact, or event referred to by *Id*, is declared to have occurred. At that previous time, *Ea*, or at a particular point in it, intimated by *Ante* generally as being prior to the event announced by *Id*, another event is represented as having taken place, as beginning to take place, or as in its progress towards a conclusion. Hence the time expressed by *Ante* comes to be identified with that announced by *Ea*, or the *Ea* is only a more restrictive mode of expressing the meaning of *ante*, so as to connect it with an event different from, and prior to, that suggested by *Id*. The terminating *Ea*, therefore, is no accusative plural referring to events, as it is commonly explained to be, but an ablative singular importing time alone. The full expression accordingly may be supposed to have run somewhat in this manner; *ante id* (factum) *ea* (tempestate;) that is, at the time which was in progress before the event referred to by *id factum*, another event, which of course comes to be immediately stated after *antea* or *antidea*, had likewise occurred, or was then occurring. The facility with which the interposed *id* was omitted, without endangering that perspicuity which is the brightest ornament of any language, enabled the Romans, first perhaps partially, to discontinue

its use, and afterwards to relinquish it entirely. But whilst despotic custom

Quem penes arbitrium est, et jus, et norma loquendi,

sanctioned the legitimacy of *antea*, it threw a veil of mystery over its origin, and confounded the investigations of the grammarian and the critic.

To illustrate the manner in which these words may have been originally employed, it may be proper to quote a single passage, and on the principles stated endeavour to render the primary use of these words more perfectly understood. *Non*, says Cicero, *accusabimur posthac; neque hercule antea negligentes fuimus.* Ad. Att. 7. 3. In the introductory clause of this sentence, there is supposed to have existed a state of continuous liability to accusation, which as an event in the course of its progress is stopped or suspended, and its continuity broken by the remark of the speaker or writer. It is intimated, then, by *Posthac*, that the course of a new state commences at the very instant (*hac* sc. tempestate) after that suspension and discontinuance of the previous state (*post.*) The persons alluded to (*we*) declare that they shall never from the commencement of this new state again expose themselves to arraignment. In the apodosis of the sentence, it is asserted that though the persons mentioned may have been accused of misconduct in that period of time (*ea*), which preceded the present suspension of liability to accusation (*ante*), they had not been guilty of negligence, and were charged without sufficient reason.[1] Whether the words introduced above be those which alone a Roman may have at first employed to fill up the elliptical defects in such sentences, we reckon it of little consequence to enquire. Our object is merely illustration, without any wish to insist upon one particular form of words to the exclusion of all others. From many sentences, however, constructed in a similar manner we are permitted to infer, that the suppletory words suggested above are not widely different from those, that may have been anciently employed. When, for instance, a less general or

---

[1] It may be of some consequence here to state that there seems to be a slight difference betwixt *ea* and *hac* in *postea, posthac, &c.* which, it is presumed, will be found to consist principally in this; *posthac* refers to a future state or event that commences *instantly* upon what may be considered as the cessation of that, which is represented as having been previously in progress; whereas *postea* may refer to a futurity that is *not immediately consequent* upon the implied cessation of that state or event, to which it conveys a retrospective allusion.

more definite idea of events and times is to be conveyed than *postea*, &c. can express, the clause of the sentence by which it is effected is constructed in a manner strikingly similar to that proposed. One or two expressions will make this manifest. *Post id factum*, says Nepos, *paucis diebus* apud Zamam cum eodem conflixit. Han. 6. 3. *Hanc post rem gestam non ita multis diebus*, M. Minucium Rufum magistrum equitum——fugavit. Id. Ib. 5. 3. As the terminating *ea* of *postea* could not have expressed with sufficient exactness the time which the author means to state in these two sentences, he presents us instead of it with the corresponding ablatives in the words *paucis diebus*, and *non ita multis diebus*, and places *post* so as to make its governing power fall upon those words which announce the previous fact, that fact to which the one immediately to be described by him was a few days posterior. The *ea* of *postea* or *postidea*, therefore, ought not to be viewed as holding the place occupied in these sentences by *id factum*, and *hanc rem gestam*, (these correspond to the *id* of *postidea*,) as those critics, who maintain that it is an accusative, must suppose, but as strictly equivalent to the ablative in these sentences, and denotive of time only, without of itself conveying to the mind any reference to the order of events.

To spend time in illustrating each of these terms individually in the same way seems quite unnecessary; what is said of one is in some measure applicable to all. Little ingenuity is required to follow out the principles laid down, and apply them to every term of similar import, and similar formation. We shall only, therefore, in this part of the discussion remark farther in regard to *interea*, that the terminating *ea* marks either that portion of time which is in progress betwixt (*inter*) two events, or the contemporaneous occurrence of one event during that of another, the one going forward at that time (*ea*) during which (*inter*) another is in progress towards its completion. This account of *interea* differs materially from that given by a critic of some note, the late Dr. Hill of Edinburgh, who maintains that the compounding *ea* in *antea*, *postea* and *interea* is the accusative plural of the pronoun, and who, with, perhaps, more ingenuity than justice, has attempted to trace a line of distinction betwixt *interea* and *interim*. The difference which he seems to suggest is hardly stated with such precision as to be quite intelligible to ordinary enquirers; but so far as I can follow his ideas, I feel myself reluctantly forced to dissent from his opinion. So far as I can perceive, the difference betwixt the *ea* of *interea*, and the *im* of

interim amounts to nothing more than that, if it be any, which may subsist betwixt *ea tempestate* and *ad eam tempestatem.*

Having finished all that seems necessary to be remarked respecting that ancient form of these words which interposes *id* betwixt the preposition and *ea* or *hac,* I proceed next to advert to a termination, obsolete indeed in the maturity of the language, but which in certain of these words is well authenticated, and to all appearance equivalent to that *ea* whose case it is the object of this paper to prove to be the ablative. The arguments derived from this branch of the investigation, though they may appear entirely founded on a hypothetical assumption, seem not less conclusive of the question at issue than any that have yet been adduced. In the writings of the more ancient Roman authors, we meet at times with such words as *postibi; interibi,* &c. occupying situations, and conveying meanings, which in the Augustan age, and for a considerable time before it, were exclusively appropriated to *postea* and *interea.*[1] All this, it is presumed, will be conceded without reluctance; but the concession may probably be followed by the very reasonable demand, how can it be shewn that this pristine form of the words can possibly be brought to bear upon the present discussion? In reply to this, we appeal to those scholars who have had occasion to compare the earlier forms of the Greek with those of the Latin language, and ask, if it never occurred to them that the Homeric termination of nouns—φι, bears a very striking affinity to the Dative of certain Latin words ending in—*bi.* If, as it is generally allowed, the Romans borrowed, or perhaps inherited the peculiar inflections of their cases from the Greeks, the occurrence of the corresponding termination in the two languages, though partial, leads us to infer a very general, perhaps a universal employment of it in forming the Dative of both, when they were first separated from the parent stock, and seems to intimate that this case, as well in Greek as in Latin, has derived its present form from casual changes produced in the pronunciation of that final syllable which was at a remote period in their history common to both the languages. To this very ancient mode of forming the dative the Latins seem to be indebted for such words as *tibi, sibi,* which in all their primitive freshness still survive those changes that have so completely disguised the original form of

---

[1] *Postibi,* as

Dat aurum; rogitat postibi, unde sit. Plaut. Rud. 3. 1. 8.

Interibi,

Abi, et istuc cura: interibi ego puerum volo mittere. Plaut. Pers. 1. 3. 85.

the same case in other words.[1] It is not improbable that the ordinary form of the Dative plural in nouns of the third, fourth, fifth, and sometimes also of the first declension, is simply a formation upon the corresponding case of the singular by the addition of a common termination to denote plurality. Such a mode of constructing a plural, one may reasonably suppose, would naturally occur, and be readily resorted to by the early authors of the fabric of a language. To make the supposition here assumed perfectly intelligible, let us suppose *—es* to have been the general plural termination of all the masculine and feminine cases in Greek and Latin, and take the pronoun *is* whose Dative singular, analogically formed, becomes upon this hypothesis *ibi*, *ibo*, or *ibu*; it matters little which of the three be preferred, as it is self-evident that the rapid enunciation of a speaker might in most cases discriminate with little accuracy betwixt what is merely a more compressed or open utterance of the final vowel. Now, if we subjoin our common plural termination, we get *ibies*, or contracted *ibis*, *iboes* or *ibos*,[2] *ibues* or *ibus* for the dative plural, according as it might happen to be pronounced; and in one district of the country this mode of uttering the word might prevail; in another, that. Now we know that one of these forms of a Dative and Ablative plural, *ibus*, is actually found, and familiar to the readers of Plautus. Hence by reasoning back from this *ibus*, though we may no longer meet with *ibi*,[3] so obviously holding the place of a Dative or Ablative singular as to command the implicit assent of the Grammarian to the justice of any attempt to rank it among the cases of *is*, there seems to be no good reason for rejecting the opinion that in the earlier and ruder times of the language its claim to that degree of relationship never was disputed. The softly enunciated *b*, it may be conceived, was gradually dropped, and *ibi*, or *iei* or *ivi* or *iwi* became ii or ei, whilst its plural *ibus* was by a similar process converted into *iis* or *eis*. As the language advanced towards maturity, those relations, which, in its early

[1] *Mihi* seems to have been arrested in its progress from *mibi* or *miei* or *mivi*, and fluctuates under the forms *mehe*, *me*, and *mi* in the Dative, which exhibit a further contraction. Vid. Gesner and Facciolati sub voc.

[2] *ibos*, as in diebos, bovebos, &c. in the inscription of the Duillian column.

[3] The adverb *ibi* is *eo* (not the adverb *eo*, which is a corruption of a very different case of the same pronoun, but the ablative of *is*) and when the ellipsis is filled up, *ibi* is *eo* (in loco.) This account of *ibi* will also explain the reason why it is used simply for *in eo* in such sentences as, *Si quid est quod ad testes reservet, ibi* (i. e. in eo) *nos quoque paratiores reperiet.* Cic. pro Rosc. Amer. 82.

stages, had been marked somewhat generally and loosely by a Dative only, were gradually indicated in a manner more restricted and precise; and the Ablative of the Grammarian after sometimes undergoing a slight change of termination, but frequently not, began to assume a character distinct from the Dative. This fact indeed has been so often insisted upon, and is so generally admitted, that the original identity of the two cases, as well in meaning as in form, will hardly now be disputed. Hence it is inferred, that if the ancient Dative of *is* can be satisfactorily proved to have been *ibi*, we are entitled to conclude that it possessed under that form also the genuine force and meaning of an Ablative. Thus, then, from *postibi*, which is held to be only a more antiquated form of *postea*, we infer that the terminating *ea* is an Ablative singular, not an accusative plural; and from the whole of the previous reasonings and arguments we conclude, that the final *a* in these words is long, not because they are adverbs, for this assertion explains nothing respecting the origin, or cause of their quantity, but because *ea* in such compounds is primarily and strictly an Ablative case, and as such follows in its quantity the ordinary laws of the language. Hence too we maintain that Gesner, Facciolati, Adam, and a host of the most eminent Lexicographers have given an erroneous account of the case of these compounding pronouns, and that they are all, on the same ground, chargeable with error in assigning a short quantity to the final *a* of *postea* in its compound *posteaquam*.

Præterea, which rarely occurs as an Adverb of time, may nevertheless probably be indebted to some such original application for its particular form and structure. Virgil indeed, who was profoundly versed in all that can, either directly, or by the influence of association, gain access to and touch the human heart, and who accordingly is careful to omit no opportunity of adorning his poetry with whatever might recall to his reader's mind the manners and language of ancient times, has in more than one passage of his immortal poems admitted or revived a signification of this word which seems, in his days, to have been rapidly falling into disuse.[1] Besides the argument that may be reasonably drawn from Virgil's application of *præterea* to time, the word *præterhac*,[2] evidently formed on the same principles, and referring, perhaps exclusively, to time, is familiar to Plautus; thus,

——*præterhac mihi non facies moram*, Mostel. i. 1. 72.

---

[1] Vide Virg. Georg. 4. 502. Æn. 1. 49., &c.

[2] Præterhac must not be confounded with præter hæc which also occurs not unfrequently.

from this time forward, at the time which immediately commences progress upon the expiration of the present instant. Whatever conclusions we may draw from such passages as this respecting the origin of *præterhac*, it seems hardly possible to doubt, that they must be equally applicable to *præterea*. But even with its more common signification we can see no very powerful reason for considering *ea* to be an Accusative. The formation of this word may be made perfectly agreeable to the analogy observed in the other words of the class by supposing that *ea* refers to the word *re*, or some one similar in meaning, gender and case that was formerly supplied; and we may conceive the full expression to have borne some resemblance to the following; *præter* (jam dicta res adhuc restat; &c.) *ea* (autem nunc scribam, loquar, hæc notanda videntur, &c.) I must here repeat that I mean not to insinuate, that the Roman, even when his language was rudest, employed so many words as are here adduced to announce the idea conveyed by *præterea*, and still less that these and these only were the precise terms in which he expressed himself. It is enough if thus, so far as the substantial part of the argument is concerned, the general doctrine can be illustrated and confirmed. At the same time, from the proofs already adduced respecting this and the other words of the series, we can hardly withold our belief, that the abridgment of some expression, corresponding pretty nearly to that proposed, gave birth to that abbreviated form which must have been gradually substituted for the more circuitous phraseology of an earlier age. To these ample and primitive modes of diction a reference may be conceived to have been always present to the speaker's mind, and to have guided his choice of the case, number and gender of those apparently incoherent and detached fragments. These fragments, ill assorted as they may appear to be to the taste of a refined and polished age, in process of time became the signs or symbols of whole sentences, and thus communicated, with more dispatch than could otherwise have been effected, the various sentiments they are calculated to convey.

The history of these compounds, even if admitted to be correct, can, I am aware, add little or nothing to our knowledge of the manner in which they ought to be used in Latin composition. But however true this remark may be, it may, nevertheless, prove of some consequence to the student of the philosophy of language, and to all those who delight to contemplate the march of the human mind, to trace the path of its advancement even within those contracted limits which the poverty of the present subject opposes to a comprehensive survey of its movements.

Edinburgh, April, 1817. *A. R. C.*

J. STACKHOUSII EMENDATIONES IN ÆLIANUM HIST. ANIM.

No. III.—(*Continued from* No. XXVIII. *p.* 289.)

Æliani H. A. ix. 31. *Ποιμένα μοι νόει νομευτικὸν ἀγαθόν.* Considera mecum? Rectius, *Ποιμένα μέν.* [Vox *νομευτικὸς* extat quidem in H. Steph. Thes. Ind. et Schneideri Lex., sed *ἁμαρτύρως.* Ed.]

—32. *Ὅπερ οὖν οἴεται καλῶς καὶ εἰς ἱλεὸν θησαύρισμα εἰληφέναι.* F. l. *ἴδιον.* [" Ita Codex alter Gesneri et Mediceus pro *οἱ ἔσται.* Pro altera voce Gesnerus *εἱλεὸν*, Kuhn ad V. H. i. 32. *εἰς δέον* reponit. Dum auctoritatem narrationis exquisiverimus, de lectione judicare non licet." Schneider. Nobis placet Stackhousii conjectura *ἴδιον.* Ed.]

—34. *Τοὺς ἑρετμοὺς μὲν τοὺς τέως προτείνας μακροτέρους οἴακας ἐργάζεται.* F. l. *ὡς οἴακας.*

—37. *Τὰ ὀρυόφια τὴν ἄνθην τῶν δένδρων σιτούμενα.* Imo *τὸν καρπόν.* V. Theophr.

—38. *Καὶ οὕσπερ οὖν φιλοῦσιν ἁλιεῖς ὀνομάζειν πρέποντας. Καὶ μέγιστοι* κ. τ. λ. Error forsan sic corrigendus, *Ὀνομάζειν. Πρέποντες καὶ μέγιστοι.* [" Hæc omnia translata sunt ab Oppiano i. 150. Cf. Aristot. viii. 15. Plin. ix. 16. qui de asello eadem tradunt. Reliquos vero pisces, oves et *πρέποντας* aliunde non novimus." Schneider. Nihil mutandum. Oppian. l. c., *Πρόβατόν τε καὶ ἴπατοι ἠδὲ πρέποντες.* Deest voc. *πρέποντες* in H. Steph. Thes. et Schneider. Lex. Ed.]

—39. *Τίκτει καὶ ἡ μηλέα.* L. *ἐν τῇ Μηλέᾳ*, sc. *Κραμβίς.* [Deinde pro *τίκτει* repone *τίκτεται.* Ed.]

—43. *Πανταχοῦ φοιτῶσι οἰστρούμενοι, καὶ μαστεύοντες τροφὴν πλείονα, ἵνα ὄγκου προσγενομένου αὐτοῖς καὶ ὑποπρησθέντες, ἀπορρήξωσιν ἑαυτῶν τὸ ἔλυτρον.* Leg. *ὑποπλησθέντες.* [Cf. cap. 63., *Οἴστρου τε ἀφροδισίου τὰ ζῷα ὑποπίμπλαται.* Ed.]

—61. *Τῆς ἐπιφανείας.* An *ἡ ἐπιφάνεια?*

X. 1. *Φησὶν ἐν συγγραφῇ Δίων, μόσχον ἐλέφαντος ὡραίαν, ὡς ἐκεῖνοι, ἰδεῖν συνελθεῖν ἐλέφαντι νέῳ καὶ καλῷ.* Transponendo corrige, *ὡραίαν ἰδεῖν, συνελθεῖν ἐλέφαντι νέῳ καὶ καλῷ, ὡς ἐκεῖνοι.* [" Gesnero insolentior et confusa constructio ita componenda videtur: *Δίων φησὶν ἀνὴρ τῆς τῶν ἐλεφάντων ἀγρας οὐκ ἄπειρος* (pro *ἀνὴρ οὐκ ἄπειρον*) *ἰδεῖν μόσχον ἐλέφαντος συνελθεῖν* et cet. De h. l. disputat Vales. Emendd. p. 124." Schneider.]

—13. *Λιθῷ δὲ ἄρα ὁ μαργαρίτης ἔοικε πεπυρωμένῳ.* L. *πεπυρωμένῃ*, ardenti, sc. Pyropo.

X. 13. *Φύσιν δὲ ἔχει τῆς περιφερείας τὸ λεῖον καὶ εὐπερίγραφον.* Sensus videtur, Similis est naturæ cum testa circumambiente.

X. 21. *Καὶ ταῖς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ξαίνουσι κνυζομένους καὶ δακρύοντας.* An *σάρκας ἀνθρώπων ἐξεμέουσι κνυζόμενοι καὶ δακρύοντες?* [" Sc. πληγαῖς. Ita enim recte h. l. interpretatur, et a variis conjecturis defendit Abresch ad Æschylum T. i. p. 140." Schneider.]

—24. *Εἰκάζουσι δὲ τὸν μὲν κροκόδειλον ἐκεῖνοι ὕδατι.* Emblema aquæ in Hieroglyphicis? ut falco ignis.

—*Ἀπότομον αὐτῶν εἶναι λέγοντες πῦρ καὶ ὕδωρ ἀμιγές. Ταῦτα οὖν πενθοῦντες Αἰγύπτιοί φασι.* An contractio ut in Hieroglyphicis? vel pro ἄτοπον. Pro ἀμιγὲς l. ἀμιγεῖς. Pro πενθοῦντες l. ἐννοοῦντες.

—25. *Κάτεισι δὲ ὑπὸ τὴν ὑπήνην αὐτοῖς γένειον.* L. ἡ ὑπήνη ὑπὸ τὸ γένειον.

—30. *Εἰ λάβοι τινὰ ἕκαστος.* Transpone, *Ἕκαστος αὐτῶν εἰ λάβοι τινά.*

—*Καὶ παραθέντος ἐφθὰ κρέα καὶ ὀπτὰ, ἐμπίπλαται.* L. παραθέντος κρεῶν ἐμπίπλαται, εἰ ἐφθὰ ἢ ὀπτά.

Φείδεται δὲ καὶ ἐσθῆτος, ἐνδὺς αὐτήν. An ἥδεται?

—31. *Τοῦ παντὸς ἂν ἡ δίκη τιμήσαιτο τήνδε τὴν ἀσπίδα.* L. πάντες ἂν σὺν δίκῃ τιμήσαιντο.

—36. *Ταῖς ὅσαι πεφύκασι* sc. *χωρίαις.* Sed rectius legeretur ἐν τόποις ὅπου.

Ἐνταῦθα γοῦν καὶ τὰς ἑαυτοῦ μούσας αὐτὸν φιλοσοφεῖν οἱ σοφοὶ τούτων φασί. Sensus, Cantilenam sacram vel philosophicam recitare.

XI. 9. *Ὅσα ἂν ἔχῃ καλῶς,* i. e. possideat, vel venetur recte, honorifice, sed potius legendum *αἰτήσῃ καλῶς.*

—10. *Εἶτα.* L. εἰ τά.

—*Ἀλλὰ μήσιός γε οὐδὲ ταύτῃ ῥᾴθυμον.* Sensus videtur, *Ἀλλὰ μηδαμῶς εἴην ταύτῃ ῥᾴθυμος.* [" *Μήσιος* Cod. alter Gesneri *μίσιος* scribit. Gesnerus *μνήσιος* emendat." Schneider.]

Ἀλλ' ὄψει τι καὶ σύμβολον. L. ἐν ὄψει, in fronte, i. e. λευκὸν τετράγωνον ἐν τῷ μετώπῳ, Herod. iii. 28.

—22. *Ὡς ὁρᾶσθαι πᾶς,* l. πᾶσι.

—23. *Καὶ φολίδας* l. κατά.

—34. *Ὑπηρέτις μὲν δὴ θεοῦ θεραπείας.* L. Σαραπίδος.

—40. *Διπάλλου βασιλέως.* An *ὑπ' ἄλλου?* [" *Καὶ δ' ἐπ' ἄλλου,* ita scripsi cum Gronovio, cui assentitur Abresch ad Æschylum iii. p. 408. et sic est in versione Gyllii. Vulgo *καὶ Διπάλλου βασιλέως,* quasi Dipallus rex fuerit." Schneider.]

XII. 5. *Ὑπὸ δὲ τῷ βωμῷ καὶ φωλεύουσι λευκοὶ, καὶ παρὰ τῷ τρίποδι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἕστηκε μῦς.* Pone punctum post *φωλεύουσι*, et corr. *λευκὸς δὲ καὶ κ. τ. λ.*

—6. *Οἱ δὲ ἀπό τε Μουσῶν* add. *ἀλλότριοι.*

—*Πλησίον τῆς θαλάττης· καὶ ἐκεῖνον, ὡς ὑμᾶς πολλάκις ἐῶσιν.* L. πλησίον τῆς θαλάττης καὶ ἐκεῖνον, οὕτως ὑμᾶς.

—7. *Καὶ ὄναρ.* L. κατ' ὄναρ.

XII. 18. *Ἐμποδίζοντα εἰς τὸν ὠκὺν δρόμον ὑπὸ ῥύμης τὸ θηρίον ὠθούμενον.* Sic transpone, *Ἐμποδίζοντα τὸ θηρίον ὑπὸ ῥώμης ὠθούμενον εἰς τὸν ὠκὺν δρόμον.*

—27. *Πυρρὸὶ δέ εἰσιν οἱ κατὰ τοῦ ἰνίου πλατεῖς, ὡς βράγχια.* Sc. *τένοντες*, aliquod simile branchiis piscium.

—32. *Πολλοὺς τίκτει καὶ διαφόρους, καὶ τὸ λειφθὲν τοῖς ἀπείροις ἄπειρον.* An lusus verborum? Vel leg. τ. λ. *ἄπειρον*, numero infinitum. [" Hæc esse corrupta, nemo non videt. In altero suo Codice *ἄπειρον* abesse testatur Gesnerus. Versio Lat. sensum bene exprimit, Quarum species omnes persequi velle infinitum foret." Schneider.]

CURÆ POSTERIORES.

Classical Journal, Vol. viii. P. 350.

Belle Aréthuse, ainsi ton onde fortunée
Roule au sein furieux, et Amphitrite étonnée
Un crystal toujours pur et des flots toujours clairs,
Que jamais ne corrompt l'amertume des mers.

M. Boyd croit que ces beaux vers de la Henriade sont imités de ce passage de St. Grégoire de Nazianze:

Οὕτω διεξῆειμεν ἥσυχον βίον·
Πηγή τις, οἶμαι, πόντιος καθ' ὑδάτων
Γλυκεῖα πικρῶν, ὥσπερ οὖν νομίζεται.

Je répondrais presque que Voltaire, bien loin d'avoir imité les vers de St. Grégoire, ne les a jamais lus. Il ne puisoit pas à des sources si éloignées. Vers la fin de sa vie, quand il se fut mis en guerre ouverte et en révolte déclarée contre la religion Chrétienne, il parcourut quelques volumes des Pères; mais ce fut pour y chercher des moyens de ridiculiser le christianisme et ses Apôtres, et non pas pour y prendre des images et des couleurs poétiques. Lorsqu'il fit la Henriade, il étoit fort jeune, et à cette époque il ne lisoit que les auteurs connus et classiques; Virgile, par exemple, où il a pris manifestement l'idée de sa comparaison. En effet, qui reconnoît dans ces vers de la dixième Eglogue, le type de ceux de Voltaire?

Extremum hunc, Arethusa, mihi concede laborem....
Sic tibi, cum fluctus subterlabere Sicanos,
Doris amara suam non intermisceat undam.

Je ne crois pas non plus M. Boyd, quand il nous dit que le vers de Racine,

Je crains Dieu, cher Abner, et n'ai point d'autre crainte,

est imité d'une phrase de St. Chrysostôme. La pensée est tellement naturelle et simple qu'elle a pu se présenter à l'esprit de St.

Chrysostôme, de Racine, et de bien d'autres. Luneau de Boisjermain, dans son Commentaire sur Athalie, pense que Racine a pu imiter ce vers et de l'Ecclésiastique; "qui timet Dominum, nihil trepidabit et non parebit," ou ce vers dont il ne nomme pas l'auteur:

Et qui craint vraiment Dieu ne craint pas autre chose.

L'opinion du Commentateur a, si non plus de vérité, au moins plus de vraisemblance que celle de M. Boyd.

A FRENCHMAN.

ADVERSARIA LITERARIA.

No. XII.

An quicquid recipitur, ad modum recipientis recipiatur? Affirmatur.

Pompeia ut vetuit Pharnaces arma secutus
Optatæ patri spem superesse fugæ,
Ille invitus adhuc his fidum affatur amicum
Dictis, qui tanto ex agmine solus adest.
Aspicis ut nequeunt, quæ vitæ prodigus hausi
Porrigere optatam toxica mortis opem!
Me tamen haud jubeas patrios dediscere mores
Romanique ducis signa superba sequi.
Non sic magni olim Ponti, cui sceptra tenebat,
Qui tanto urgebat regna aliena metu,
Supplicibus credas Pompeium accedere votis,
Et majestatem prodere posse suam!
Ergo age et hoc (restat misero mihi sola salutis
Hæc via:) jam properes ense ferire latus.
Sit mihi sit pulchrum infelicem ponere vitam,
Sit nato dominis posse placere novis.

J. BURROWS.

An detur in rerum naturâ absoluta quies? Negatur.

Scipio ut incensas captæ Carthaginis arces
Mæniaque irato milite strata videt,
Solvitur in lacrymas; jam pristina gloria gentis,
Urbis jam antiquæ splendida imago subit:
Nunc animo occurrit, quoties nova bella movebat
Carthago, et quantos misit in arma duces;
Magnanimi quales ibant in prælia Barcæ,
Quot Mago, quot cædes impiger Hanno dabat!
Tum quæ bella tulit victricibus Hannibal armis,
Ut Canusi immenso funere stravit agrum.
Inde et supremi recolens discrimina belli
Tandem hæc fatidico pectore verba movet;

Imperii Carthago ruis longùm æmula nostri!
Et gaudet magno Roma soluta metu.
Quin tu, præclarum jactes utcunque triumphum,
Et spolia ultrici plurima rapta manu,
Tu mox plorabis similem subversa ruinam,
Tu pariter summo à culmine Roma rues.

J. BURROWS.

An aliquid violentum sit diuturnum? Negatur.

JAM cœlum affectans, vitæ jam exosa tumultus
Accedit sanctos virgo pudica lares.
Templa patent, tristesque instaurant ordine pompas
Et varias explent sedula turba vices—
Pars manibus lychnos immensa per atria portant,
Pars sacris spargunt thura sabæa focis,
Atque ipsa in matris jam longùm amplexibus hæret
Et visa est timidæ prodere signa moræ—
Ergo et flexanimi præbent solatia cantus,
Et dubiam firmant organa sancta fidem,
Nec cessat speranda piis spondere sacerdos
Præmia, et hærentem spe stimulare novâ.
Atque monet castas animas et labe carentes
Quæ tandem in superâ gaudia sede manent.
Illa immota diu paulatim lumina tollit
Ad cœlum, et tremulo concipit ore preces.
Tum ponit quo cultu olim quâ veste solebat
Inter virgineos pulchrior ire choros.
Vosque leves curæ jubeo jam rite valere,
Inquit, deliciis jam fruitura novis.
Ah ne tanta tibi demum spes irrita cedat
Quam nunc arrectâ fervida mente foves!
Ah te nulla unquam mutatæ tædia sortis
Tangant; deliciis usque fruare tuis!

J. BURROWS.

An quidquid recipitur ad modum recipientis, recipiatur? Affirmatur.

DUM gemit Æmilius mediis immista triumphis
Funera, et orbatæ tristia fata domus,
Ritè tamen sacrâ scandit capitolia pompâ
Atque hoc invicto pectore verba movet.
Hoc est, quod volui, neque enim fortuna fefellit
Me mea, in adversas mox abitura vices.
Vidi ego jam domitam Æmathiam, jam Persea captum
Ad nostros vidi procubuisse pedes.

Tum nimium faustis cœpi diffidere rebus,
Mensque est visa aliquid præmonuisse malum.
Ergo in me ajebam, si quam fatâ invida cladem,
Si quam mutati numinis ira parat,
In me tota ruat; sit tantum in cætera sospes,
Sit tantum imperio patria salva suo.
Nec visum est aliter superis; stant omnia vobis
Integra; me gemino vulnere fata premunt:
Et video gemino extinctis jam funere natis
Nullam ultra Æmiliæ spem superesse domus—
Quicquid id est, potero vestris tamen usque triumphis
Cladesque et luctus posthabuisse meos.

J. BURROWS.

Admonita locorum.

Inter hyperboreas sedes, terramque Britannûm
Quâ vix prompsit adhuc sera Thalia melos,
Cur jubeor Musæ peregrinæ tortor ineptus
Italicis frustra desipuisse modis?
Aspice ut invitis oneratur fructibus arbos
Radices mutilas questa, polumque novum,
Quem dura Agricolæ manus in sua transtulit arva
Ut procul a patriâ marceat exul humo!
Versibus en nostris sic Musa exotica languet,
Heu non Angliaco convenit illa solo!
Fortunate puer, qui littora sacra pererras,
Et loca Pieriis non aliena choris,
Quâ serpit placidus cantato Mincius amne,
Et Tiberis volvit nobilitatus aquas,
Hic ultrò inspirant rura ipsa Poetica cantus,
Musaque dat faciles non operosa modos,
Quâ juga non ipsi tollunt ingloria montes,
Nec saltus gelidi, nec sine vate nemus.
In numerum liquido trepidat modulamine rivus,
Asserit et laudes fons memor usque suas.
Hic Naso argutos olim narrabat amores,
Audiit hæc numeros sylva, Tibulle, tuos.
Nunc etiam memores servant loca nota camœnæ,
Et latet in dumis jam pharetratus amor.
O Deus, O si quis magico me littore sistat,
Natale Aonidum fas sit adire solum!
Vocales inter sylvas, argutaque saxa
Indigenam sumat nostra camœna lyram,
Perque sacras valles, divinaque rura canentis
Accipiat nostrum turba canora melos!

J. BURROWS.

Age, dic Latinum,
Barbite, carmen. HORAT.

Inesse credo cœlitus ingenî
Diviniorem huic particulam, suis
Qui primus insuetas per artes
Verba dedit socianda chordis;
Qui primus œstro percitus igneo, et
Furore dulci plenus, in arduum
Conscendit, haud segnis relictam
Spernere humum fugiente pennâ.
Illi citatus pectoris impetus
Miranda rerum ostendit, et intima
Arcana Naturæ canoris
Explicuit fidibus magistræ.
Hinc facta vivunt, hinc memorabile
Nomen supremum fertur in æthera,
Mortique non cedens avaræ
Per medias solet ire nubes:
Vivunt adhuc, qui laurigerum decus,
Non indecoro pulvere sordidum,
Tulere; quos Victoria egit
Per veteris monumenta famæ;
Vivunt adhuc, qui mordicus humidam
Vulsere terram, cedere nescii,
Qui sponte pro terris avitis
Egregiam posuere vitam.
At non superbam Græcia gloriam
Tulit duello sola; nec addidit
Heroas insignes sacrorum
Sola Deûm in numerum; sed armis
Egit triumphos plurima nobiles
Gens; sunt et ipsis carmina; sunt lyræ,
Cantare magnorum potentes
Facta diu memoranda regum.
Est et Latino gloria nomini,
Vivuntque multi haud illacrymabiles,
Quos servat ornatos piorum
Pagina, non pictura, vatum.
Damnosa nunquam deminuet dies,
Non flamma, non vis, Flacce, tuum melos;
Viventque demissi per ævum
Aufidicæ numeri Camœnæ.

J. B. 1810.

Translation from VINCENT BOURNE.

SUICIDA.

Musca meam volitat circum importuna lucernam,
Alasque amburit jam prope jamque suas.
Sæpe repello manu venientem, et, Ineptula musca!
Quæ te, inquam, impellit tanta libido mori?
Illa tamen redit, et, quanquam servare laboro,
Instat, et in flammas exitiumque ruit.
Exiguam tibi nolo animam, quam projicis, ultra
Servare: et, si sis certa perire, peri.

'Ο ΑΥΤΟΦΟΝΤΗΣ.

Μυΐά ποθ' ἱπταμένη περὶ λαμπάδα μαρμαρέσσαν,
Φλέγματι δειλαίᾳ τῷ πτέρυγ' ἠνθράκισεν.
Πολλάκι ἐγὼ παλάμαισιν ἀπώθεον ἄσσον ἰοῦσαν,
Θωΰσσων, τί πόθος τοῖος ἔνεστι θανεῖν;
Ἀλλὰ μάτην καὶ τοῦτο· παλίντροπος ἔσσυται, ἠδὲ
Νήπιος ἐν μανίαις ὄλλυται αὐτοφόνοις.
Ἔρρεο, εἰ τόγε θυμὸς ἐπέσσυται· οὐκέτι σώσω
Σὸν βίον· εἰ μάλα λῇς, ἔρρεο εἰς Ἀΐδου.

J. B. 1811.

Carmina Quadragesimalia.

Hìc ubi cupressi tristes, ubi lurida taxus
Parvula nigranti fronde sepulchra tegit;
Hìc viridi subtùs tumulo, vetus incola ruris
Æterno obductus membra sopore, jacet.
Non illis Pariæ moles extructa columnæ,
Non illis busti surgit inane decus:
Sed longa ignotos urgent oblivia Manes,
Et neglecta rudis contegit ossa lapis.
Hìc tamen, hìc potuit forsan divinior aura
Mentis, et ætherius delituisse vigor;
Hìc qui subjecto potuit dominarier orbi,
Aut sæva ultrici bella movere manu;
Sed vetuit fortuna; sed arcta repressit egestas,
Et dura edomuit corda laboris onus.

* * *

Jam Consul, Parthosque parans incessere bello,
Infaustum Crassus cum properaret iter:

Contra urbis limen servans, portamque Capenam,
Cinctusque iratâ plebe, Tribunus adest;
Vicinasque tenens aras, arcana Deorum
Numina, vix hominum voce cienda, vocat.
Tune ergò Euphratem superans tranquilla lacesses,
Et nunquam Latio debita regna jugo?
Nec quidquam populo curas data fata Quirini,
Nec tu fatidicæ scripta verenda Deæ?
Ergò sine auspiciis, Consul, sine numine Divum,
Romana in vetitum provehis arma solum;
Quod tibi enim augurium, quæ fausta reportat aruspex
Omina, quæ supero vota litata Jovi?
At me vatem habeas—si bella injusta malignos,
Ut reor, ut spero, sint habitura Deos,
Ipse cadas quam primum, oro, et sine clade tuorum
Ipse luas proprium, victima justa, scelus.

G. CANNING.

Lympha sitim pellit, rabidum levat aura calorem,
Vina fugant curas, amor ipse medetur amori.

Scævole de Ste. Marthe.

Menage, Antibaillet T. 1. p. 9, 10. quotes a Latin Fable, in 24 Iambics, and a Greek Epigram of 2 lines, written by Salmasius against Cercoëtius, i. e. Petavius, with whom he had one of his squabbles.

The Epigram is a translation of Catullus's *Mentula conatur*, &c. and the fable a paraphrase of the following lines of Jos. Scaliger (Prolegom. ad Canon. Isagog.) against our Lydiat;

ἠλιβάτου κατὰ δένδρου ἀνερρίχατο πίθηκος
αἰπὺν ἐπεισβαίνειν οὐρανὸν ἐλπόμενος.
δραξάμενος δ' ἄκρου, καὶ οὐκ ἐπέκεινα παρελθὼν
τοῖσι θεασάμενος πρωκτὸν ἔδειξε μόνον.

Epitaph on VIGLIUS *in the Cathedral of Ghent.*

Qui curas Regum et Regnorum pondera obivit,
Pervigil hic dormit Viglius in tumulo.
Parce pios, Lector, manes turbare, quietem
Hæc post tot vigiles vindicat umbra dies.
At vigilis Vigli exemplo vigil esse memento;
Nil etenim vita est, sit nisi vita vigil.

Scævola, the great Roman lawyer, being asked what work might be performed on a holy day, said: *quod omissum noceret.*

The son of the President Thuanus, (De Thou) was condemned to death by Cardinal Richelieu, for refusing to betray a secret entrusted to his honor of a conspiracy against the Minister. Hence the occasion of the following distich:

O Legum subtile nefas! quibus inter amicos
Nolle fidem frustra perdere proditio est!

Barthelemi Facio carried his hatred of Laurentius Valla to such a height, that when, on his death-bed, he was informed that his enemy was dead, he said:

Ne vel in Elysiis, sine vindice, Valla susurret,
Facius haud multos post obit ipse dies.

Tweddell's Epigram on *Quid Novi*, which is enquired after in No. XXV. of the *Classical Journal*, I should conjecture to have been composed on his way home from a raree show, where he had seen a learned goose, the chess-playing automaton, and a hare performing the manual exercise. Were the world drowned a second time, Deucalion and Pyrrha need not again cast stones behind them to become the parents of a future race; for we have already a new race which can perform human actions.

W. S. T.

In the Life of Mr. Gibbon, written by himself, and published in his miscellaneous Works, is the following passage: "In the perusal of Livy (xxx. 44.) I had been stopped by a sentence in a speech of Hannibal, which cannot be reconciled, by any torture, with his character or argument. The commentators dissemble or confess their perplexity. It occurred to me that the change of a single letter by substituting *otio* instead of *odio*, might restore a clear and consistent sense, but I wished to weigh my emendation in scales less partial than my own; I addressed myself to M. Crevier, the successor of Rollin, and a professor in the university of Paris, who had published a large and valuable edition of Livy; his answer was speedy and polite, he praised my ingenuity, and adopted my conjecture." Gibbon's Misc. i. p. 70, Dublin, 1796. M. Crevier's letter is published in the Appendix, p. 307, and is quite as flattering to Mr. Gibbon as he represents it, "J'adopte toutes vos observations, tous vos raisonnemens; par le changement d'une seule lettre vous substituez à un sens louche et obscur une pensée

claire, convenable au caractère de celui qui parle," &c. The sentence in Hannibal's speech is as follows: "tunc flesse decuit, quum ademta nobis arma, incensæ naves, interdictum externis bellis, illo enim vulnere concidimus; nec esse in vos *odio vestro consultum* ab Romanis credas," &c. Perhaps the old reading, *odio*, may be defended upon the authority of the following passage in Justin, lib. vi. cap. 6.: "Artaxerxes, rex Persarum, legatos in Græciam mittit, per quos jubet omnes ab armis discedere, qui aliter fecisset, eum se pro hoste habiturum, civitatibus libertatem suaque omnia restituit: quod non Græciæ laboribus assiduisque bellorum internecivis *odiis consulens* fecit, sed ne," &c. I believe no person would propose to substitute *otiis* in this latter passage, and yet the two seem exactly parallel; in both foreign war is interdicted, and the reason of the prohibition is assigned not to be as might at first be imagined *odiis consulere*, to avoid the exciting or the gratifying those angry passions and deadly hatreds, which as they are the frequent causes of war, so are they to be reckoned among its most fatal effects. *Consulere*, which signifies merely taking into consideration, may be either in a good or a bad sense; of good to be sought, or evil to be avoided. Hannibal's speech is so striking a passage, that it has been necessarily translated by all the compilers. They in general, as Sir W. Raleigh, Rollin, &c. dissembling their perplexity, omit this sentence altogether. The Universal History, vol. vii. p. 84. translates, "do not imagine that the Romans, out of any particular aversion to you, have formed a scheme for your destruction." This sounds strangely in Hannibal's mouth. But it is remarkable, that Hooke, b. iv. c. 37. translates thus, "do not flatter yourselves that the Romans have consulted your *quiet*;" evidently correcting it *otio*. Hooke's first edition was published in 1745, and the second, which only I have seen, in 1756, the same year in which Crevier's letter to Gibbon was written. Could the emendation have reached him so soon? or did he correct it himself without claiming so much credit for it? I have no doubt that Mr. Gibbon did not borrow it from him. I have an edition of Crevier's Livy, Paris, 1768, typis Barbou, which reads *odio* with an obscure note to explain it. Perhaps it is but a reprint of an older edition. Upon the whole it may seem, 1st, that the correction is unnecessary; 2d, that Hooke has a claim to the merit of it, such as it is, as strong as Mr. Gibbon; and 3dly, that Crevier, who first adopted it, may have subsequently rejected it.

W. S. T.

THE *trial by Ordeal, the favorite offspring of superstition, has been by Fleury, Le Brun, and others, supposed to be derived from the ancients, because Pliny, (l. 8. c. 2.) mentions a family in*

Tuscany, upon whom the sacred [illegible] made in honor of Apollo, had no effect. But M. Howard, [illegible] much more appearance of reason, imagines that it originated from the miracles attributed by the Christians to their Saints. (*Traités sur les Coutumes Anglo-Normandes, tom* i. *p.* 577.) However that may be, this mode of trial existed here so early as the reign of Ina; and William the First found it in use in this country, when he mounted the throne. His Normans, attached by early habit to the trial by duel, rejected a mode of decision, which appeared to them as a superstitious formality, though it was still suffered to be resorted to by old and maimed men, and by women. According to the laws of Ina, the accused had the choice of the trial by fire, or that by water. If he preferred the former, an iron was prepared that weighed three pounds at the most. No person, except the priest, whose duty it was to preside on the occasion, entered the temple, after the fire destined to heat the iron was kindled. The iron being placed upon the fire, two men posted themselves on each side of the iron to determine upon the degree of heat it ought to possess. As soon as they were agreed upon this point, the same number of men were introduced *ab utroque latere*, and they also placed themselves at the two extremities of the iron. All these witnesses passed the night fasting, &c.—At day-break, the priest, after sprinkling them with the holy water, and making them drink, presented them with the book of the Evangelists to kiss, and then crossed them. The mass then began. From that moment the fire was no more increased: but the iron was left on the embers, until the last collect. That finished, the iron was raised, and the most profound silence was observed, in praying the Deity to manifest the truth. At this instant, the accused took the iron into his hand, and carried it to the distance of nine feet, *juxta mensuram pedum ejus*. The trial being ended, the hand of the accused was bound up, and the bandage sealed; and, three days after, the hand was examined, to ascertain whether it was or not *impure*, which Mr. Howard thus explains: *ce qui doit, je crois, faire entendre que l'on n'étoit pas coupable, quand la main conservoit des marques de brûlure, mais seulement lorsque la brûlure tomboit en supuration* (*ubi supra.*)

But, if the accused elect the trial by water, then the water was placed in a vessel, and heated to the highest degree. For inferior crimes, the accused plunged his arm up to the wrist; for crimes of deeper dye, he plunged it up to the elbow. In every other part of the ceremony, the two species of trial by water and fire agreed. (LL. Inæ c. 77.)

The Mirror coincides with the text of Glanville, (c. iii. s. 23.) and Lord Hale informs us, "that in all the time of King John, the purgation *per ignem et aquam*, or the trial by ordeal, continued, as appears by frequent entries upon the rolls: but, it seems

to have ceased with this king, for I do not find it in use in any time after." (Hist. Com. Lan. 152.)—pp. 350, 361, 2.

In Sophoclis Ajacem *Emendationes.*

Hæc emendationum sylloge confecta est e Schedis Viri apud Oxonienses doctrina cumulatissimi. Is, Brunckiana editione nondum visa, has conjecturas paucas margini editionis Johnsonianæ allevit, nonnullis quoque adjectis, quas e libro olim Toupiano, non ante vulgatas, descripserat.

28. τρέπει: lege νέμει ex Ald. [ita Brunck.]
44. βούλημ': lege βούλευμα [ita Br.]
46. ποίαισι τόλμαις ταῖσδε καὶ φρενῶν θράσει: lege τοῦτο [rectius fortasse τῷ δὲ καὶ: vid. Porson ad Phœn. 1373]
61. φόνου: lege πόνου [ita Schol. pro var. lect.]
80. εἰς δόμους: lege ἐν δόμοις ex Ald.
168. Dawesium p. 224. sequor [ita Br.]
179. ἤτιν': lege ἥντιν' cum Johnsono.
210. lege Τελεύταντος.
211. lege δουριάλωτον [ita Br.]
215. βάρος: lege πάθος ex Ald.
216. ἡμὶν et ὑμὶν ita accentu sunt notanda. [Vid. Elmsleium in Præfat. ad Œdip. Tyr.]
259. φρόνιμος: lege φρόνιμον ex Ald.
330. lege λόγοις e Stobæo. [ita Br.]
379. πάνθ' ὁρῶν: lege πᾶν θροῶν.
392. ταῦτ': lege ταῦθ': ex Ald.
405, 6. An legendum εἰ τὰ πρὶν φθίνει, φίλοι, τοῖσδ' ὁμοῦ πέλας. *Si priora facta contemptui habentur æque ac hæc præsentia.*
427. προκεῖται: lege πρόκειμαι: [ita Schol. προκείμενός εἰμι. et Br. tacite.]
443. κάρτος: lege κράτος ex Ald.
448. ἀπῆξαν: lege ἀπεῖρξαν: [ita MS. D. et sane vera lectio est γνώμης μ' ἀπεῖρξαν: G. B.]
476. κἀναθεῖσα: lege κἀνεθεῖσα [ita Br.]
515. μου: lege μοι ex Ald.
567. κοινῇ: lege κοινὴν ex Ald.
688=679. lege ἡμῖν cum Kustero, vice ἥμην.
736=725. lege κἄνθεν. οὗτις ut vitetur Anapæstus in 4ta Sede. [ita Br. tacite pro κἄνθεν· κοὔτις.]
784=773. τότ': lege vel τοῦτ': vel τόδ' [hic postremum Musgr.]
793=782. εἰ δ' ἀπεστερήμεθα lege εἰ δ' ἀφυστερήμεθα [Conjectura sane speciosa et fortasse vera.]
890=881. ἄγρας: lege ἔδρας ex Ald.
905=895. τῷδε: lege τοῦδε [*misericordiam propter hunc.*]

946=934. ἄρα γ' : lege ἄρ' ἦν [fortasse ex Ald. ita enim Br. tacite.]
1017=998. ὀξεία—βᾶξις : fortasse ὠκεῖα : vid. Aristoph. Av. 925.
1027=1008. lege ἦ πού με Τελαμὼν [e Toupio ad Suid. V. ποῖ.)
1041=1022. παῦρα δ' ὠφελήσιμοι : lege ὠφελήσιμα [ita Br.] et confer Aristoph. Ran. *Ὀλίγον τε χρηστόν ἐστιν.*
1052. τοῦτ' : lege τοῦδ' : [ita Br. tacite.]
1072=1052. ἄξειν : lege ἄγειν ex Ald. [Br. ἄξειν.]
1093=1073. lege καθεστήκει ex Ald.
1131=1112. lege *οἱ πόνου πολλοὶ πλέῳ—vulgus labore victum quæritans.*
1162=1143. lege ναύτας ex Ald.
1164=1145. lege κρυφεὶς ex Ald.
1289=1272. lege κἀνόητ' [ita MSS.]
1313=1296. lege φιτεύσας [ex Heathio.]
1375=1358. lege *βροτοῖς inconstantes ab hominibus censentur* [ita Br. e MSS. 2.]
1409=1392. τόν : lege τόνδ'.
1433=1416. lege κοὐδενὶ γάρ πω.

Toupii.

57. κτείνειν ἔχων : lege ἑλών.
85. lege δεδορκότι.
309. lege ἐρειστθεὶς [quod Schol. pro var. lect. exhibet.]
313. lege φανοίην [ita Br. e MS.]
381. τ' ἄλημα : lege πάλημα. [Vid. Musgr.]
389. lege ἐχθροπάλημα.
431. lege ξυνάσειν [sed vid. Dawes.]
850, 1, 2. 3=839—842. Spuria hæc. Vid. Schol. *ταῦτα δὲ νοθεύεσθαί φησιν.*
953=940. lege *οὐ δείνον ἔστί.*

Critical Remarks *on some Passages in* Diodorus Siculus.

Diodore de Sicile, l. xiii. c. 82. T. ii. p. 607. Edition de Wesseling. Il s'agit du temple de Jupiter Olympien, que les Agrigentins avaient fait élever. On lit : *τῶν ΔΕ ΣΤΟΩΝ τὸ μέγεθος καὶ τὸ ὕψος ἐξαίσιον ἐχουσῶν.* La suite de la description, et l'expression *γλυφαῖς, bas-relief*, qui s'y trouve, prouvent qu'il faut lire *τῶν ΄ΑΕΤΩΝ τὸ μέγεθος καὶ τὸ ὕψος ἐξαίσιον ἐχόντων.*[1]—Il s'agit en effet des frontons et non des portiques.

[1] On trouve en effet *ἐχόντων* dans un Ms. Ed.

L. xiv. c. 5. p. 643. Diodore dit, en parlant des trente tyrans d'Athènes, ἀνεῖλον δὲ καὶ *Αὐτόλυκον ἄνδρα παῤῥησιαστήν*. Je ne conçois pas qu'on n'ait pas reconnu ici Autolycus le Pancratiaste, celèbre par le banquet de Xénophon, qui fut effectivement mis à mort par les trente tyrans, comme on peut le voir dans Plutarque, Vie de Lysandre, c. 15. et dans Pausanias, l. ix. c. 33. Il faut donc corriger dans Diodore, *ἄνδρα Παγκρατιαστήν*.

L. xv. c. 43. t. ii. p. 35. Diodore raconte le siège d'une petite ville de l'Egypte par Iphicrates et par les Perses, qui avaient alors les Athéniens pour alliés. On y lit que les Egyptiens πολλὰ πλεονεκτοῦντες, διὰ τὴν τῶν ὅπλων ὀχυρότητα, συμπλοκὰς ἐποιοῦντο τοῖς πολεμίοις συνεχεῖς. L'Expression ὀχυρότης ne s'employe point en parlant des armes; il faut donc lire : διὰ τὴν τῶν τόπων ὀχυρότητα.[1]

L. xv. c. 52. p. 44. περὶ γὰρ τὰς πύλας ἀπήντησε τοῖς περὶ τὸν *Ἐπαμινώνδαν* κήρυξ τυφλὸν ἄνδρα ἀποδεδρακότα κομίζων, καὶ, καθάπερ ἦν εἰθισμένον, ἀνηγόρευε κηρύττων, μήτ' ἐξάγειν θήβηθεν, μήθ' ἀφανίζειν, ἀλλ' ἀπάγοντα πάλιν ἀνασώζειν. On ne voit guères, comment un aveugle peut prendre la fuite. Que signifie d'ailleurs l'expression κομίζων? Si le crieur public le ramenait, quel besoin avait-il de faire la proclamation qui suit? Il faut donc corriger : δοῦλον ἄνδρα ἀποδεδρακότα κηρύττων.

L. xv. c. 64. p. 52. Diodore fait le récit de l'invasion des Béotiens et de leurs alliés dans la Laconie. Il dit que le pays de Sciris était gardé par Ischolas. Il ajoute : οὗτος δὲ τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων Στρατιῶτων ἐπετελέσατο πρᾶξιν ἡρωϊκὴν, καὶ μνήμης ἀξίαν. Ce passage n'a pas grand sens. Je crois qu'il faut lire : οὗτος δὲ εἷς τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων *Σπαρτιατῶν*. Le changement de *Στρατιῶτων* en *Σπαρτιατῶν* me paraît nécessaire. On voit dans Xénophon, (hist. Gr. L. 6. c. 5. §. 24, et suiv.) que cet Ischolas, qu'il nomme *Ἰσχόλαος*, avait sous son commandement les νεοδαμώδεις de Sparte, ce qui prouve, qu'il tenait un rang distingué.

L. xvii. c. 45. p. 194. Diodore dit que les Tyriens, pour se défendre contre Alexandre, *Βύρσας καὶ διπλᾶς διφθέρας πεφυκαμένας καταῤῥάπτοντες, εἰς ταύτας ἀπεδέχοντο τὰς τῶν πετροβόλων πληγάς*. Je suis surpris que personne n'ait été blessé de cette expression, *πεφυκαμένας*. Je crois qu'il faut lire *πεφυσημένας* : ce qui convient très bien pour des *outres*, qu'on remplissait de vent, et qu'on suspendait devant les murs, pour amortir l'effet des machines de guerre.

L. xvii. c. 82. p. 224. Il s'agit de l'expédition d'Alexandre dans le pays des Paropamisades, où son armée éprouva un froid excessif. Diodore dit : ἔνιοι δὲ διὰ τὴν τῆς χιόνος ἀνταύγειαν, καὶ σκληρότητα τῆς ἀναβαλλομένης ἀνακλάσεως, ἐφθείροντο. Il manque ici deux mots,

---

[1] Ne pourrait on point lire ὅπλων ἰσχυρότητα? Ed.

qu'il faut suppléer ainsi, *ἀνακλάσεως, τὰς ὄψεις ἐφθείροντο.* Quinte-Curce, qui a suivi les mêmes auteurs que Diodore, dit, en parlant de cette expédition, L. 7. c. 3. §. 13. *multos exanimavit rigor insolitus nivis; multorum adussit pedes; plurimorum oculis præcipue perniciabilis fuit.* C.

ENCORE QUELQUES MOTS SUR L'INSCRIPTION DE LA COLONNE DE DIOCLETIEN A ALEXANDRIE.

Les remarques de M. le Col. Leake, insérées dans le numéro XXIX. p. 161, demandent quelques mots d'explication. Il avance que l'auteur d'une note qui avait paru dans le numéro XXVIII. "is incorrect in saying, that M. de Chateaubriand transcribed M. de Villoison's explanation into his book; for M. de Chateaubriand's remarks upon the inscription are confined to a very few suggestions," &c. J'ose avancer à mon tour que M. Leake *is incorrect.* En effet, comme l'a dit fort exactement l'auteur de la note qui a déplu au savant Colonel, l'explication de M. de Villoison a été textuellement réimprimée dans le troisième volume de l'Itinéraire de M. de Chateaubriand. Cette réimpression contient six pages marquées *—******; et ces six pages sont placées après la page 216, dans un assez grand nombre d'exemplaires que j'ai examinés à cette occasion: manqueroient-elles à celui de M. le Colonel? C'est possible: mais il n'en est pas moins vrai que l'auteur de la note *is not incorrect, and that M. L. is incorrect.* C'est ce qu'il falloit démontrer.

Le Colonel reproche à M. Jaubert et à feu M. de Villoison de n'avoir pas eu la candeur d'avouer que la copie de l'inscription étoit due aux Anglais, et cela pour ajouter, *quocunque modo,* une feuille de laurier à la couronne de la *Grande-Nation.* J'ai eu quelques relations avec M. de Villoison, et je ne crains pas d'affirmer qu'il étoit totalement incapable de la basse jalousie dont on l'accuse. Pour M. Jaubert, dont je crois le caractère fort estimable, il n'a pas besoin que je le défende; il se défendra lui-même, et expliquera, s'il le juge à propos, la réticence qui lui est imputée.

L'honorable Colonel ajoute qu'il voit, avec chagrin, que l'annotateur soutienne et favorise (*inadvertently perhaps*) les procédés peu délicats de M. M. Jaubert et Villoison. Cet annotateur est l'homme du monde le plus étranger à toutes ces pointilleries de jalousie nationale; il n'a jamais cherché en étudiant que la vérité et le plaisir d'étudier; et il reconnoît, sans peine et sans regret, que c'est à M. M. Leake, Hamilton, et Squire, que l'on doit la copie de l'inscription de la colonne d'Alexandrie.

B—A—P—R.

GREEK LETTER OF BENNET LANGTON.

Mr. Editor,

As you have been kind enough to insert (No. xxix. pp. 179, 180.) a specimen of John Tweddell's early attempts in the composition of Greek verse, before he quitted Hartforth School for Trinity College, Cambridge; I am encouraged to beg admission for another curious article, in Greek prose, from the pen of Bennet Langton, recorded as one of Dr. Johnson's much loved and justly valued friends.

The writer, from the date 1801, (and vide *Life of Johnson*, v. 1. pp. 223, 4, 5.) must have been nearly a Septuagenarian at the time. The Letter itself is addressed to a young Gentleman then a student, I believe, at the University of Edinburgh, and attending the Greek class of Professor Dalzel; and though not free from faults obvious to the critical eye, yet even such an ἐπιστόλιον bears high testimony to both the correspondent parties.

In the prime of life, what must *Bennet Langton* have been!

" O suavis anima, quale in te dicam bonum
" Antehac fuisse, tales cum sint reliquiæ!"

29th *May*, 1817. *R. S. Y.*

Βένεττος Λάγγτονος
Ἰωάννῃ Ἰλέρμῳ Μακκείῳ
Εὖ πράττειν.

Ἐκομισάμην τὸ σοῦ ἐπιστόλιον, καὶ ἡδύ μοι ἐγένετο, ὅταν ἀνοίξας εἶδον αὐτὸ Ἑλληνιστὶ φθεγγόμενον· καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου τοῦ τεκμηρίου, πιθανῶς ἐστι συμβαλεῖν ὑπάρξειν σε ἐκ τῶν παιδείᾳ εὐδοκιμούντων. Πιστεύω δὲ, ὅτι οὐδ' ἄν τις μετάμελός σε ἔχοι τῶν ἐπιχειρηθέντων· τίς γὰρ ἔξαρνος εἴη τὴν παιδείαν εἶναι τὸ τιμιώτατον τῶν χρημάτων. Καλῶς οὖν σοι καὶ ἐπιτυχῶς εὔχομαι τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἐπιτήδευσιν τήνδε φέρεσθαι· καὶ ἐν τῷ τοῦ σκόπου τούτου ἀξιεπαίνου ἐπιστοχάζεσθαι, οὐκ ἀμελήσεις, (εὖ οἶδ' ὅτι) ὄναθαι τῆς παιδεύσεως τοῦ αἰδεσίμου Μεαρσίου, τοῦ ἄνδρος ἀγαθοῦ καὶ λογίου, ὃς νῦν σε ἐπιτετραμμένος ἐστὶν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν διατελέσεις αὐτὸν θεραπεύων. Ἔρρωσο.

Ποσειδεῶνος πέμπτῃ ἱσταμένου. Ἔτει ἀπὸ τῆς Θεογονίας πρώτῳ πρὸς τοῖς χιλίοις καὶ ὀκτακοσίοις.

Literary Intelligence.

LATELY PUBLISHED.

GERMANY.

The catalogue of the books published at the Michaelmas Leipzig fair, 1816, having just reached this country, we have great pleasu e in presenting our usual extract to our readers.

Agrell, C. M. commentat. de varietate generis et numeri in ll. Oo. Heb. Arab. et Syriac. Pars 1—2. 4to. *Lundæ et Havniæ*, 1815-16.

Aischylos Agamemnon metrisch übersetzt von W. v. Humbold. 4to. *Leipzig*, 1816.

Αἰσχύλου προμηθεὺς δεσμώτης. Aischylos gefesselter Prometheus. Griech. mit einer Vorrede von Dr. A Neubig. 8vo. *Nürnberg*, 1816.

Antaræ poema Arab. Moallakah c. integris Zouzenii Scholiis. Edid. et lect. var. addid. V. E. Menil. Observatt. ad tot. poema subj. J. Wilmet. 4to. *Lugd. et Lipsiæ*, 1816.

Arnold, A. Geschichte von Syracus. Von Gründung d. Stadt bis auf den Umsturz d. Freiheit durch Dionysius. 8vo *Gotha*, 1816.

Ciceronis M. T. Opera quæ supersunt omnia, ac deperditor. fragmenta. Curav. C. G. Schütz. Tom. xiii—xv. 8vo. *Lipsiæ*, 1816.

Ciceronis M. T. operum tom. iv. 12mo. *Lips.* Tauchnitz, 1816.

——— Orationes xii. selectæ pro Roscio Amerino, in L. Catilinam etc. mit hist. krit. u. erklarenden Anmerkungen v. A. Möbius. 8vo. *Hannover*, 1816.

Creuzer F. Meletemata e disciplina antiquitatis. Pars 1ma. Anecdota Græca ex codd. maxime Palatinis depromta. 8vo. *Lipsiæ*, 1816.

Herodoti Halicarn. historiarum libr. ix. opera F. V. Reizii. vol. i. pars i. ed. tert. emend. 8vo. *Lipsiæ*, 1816.

Klein, F. A. de loquendi formula *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν.* 8vo. *Jenæ*, 1816.

Lindau, A. F. novum in Platonis Timæum et Christiani conject. specimen. 8vo. *Breslau*, 1816.

——— de usu et præstantia artium et literarum Græcarum. 8vo. *Ibid.* 1816.

——— Briefe über Sarmatien. Veranlasst durch einiger Stellen in Herodot's Melpomene. 8vo. *Ibid.* 1816.

Münter, F. Religion der Karthager. 8vo. *Kopenhagen*, 1816.

Osann, D. F. Analecta critica scenicæ Romanæ poesis reliquias illustrantia. Insunt Plauti fragmenta a Maio in cod. Ambros. nuper reperta. 8vo. *Berolini*, 1816.

Pindar, pythische Siegesgesänge, übersetzt m. Anmerkungen v. Dr. J. Gurlitt. 4to. *Hamburg*, 1816.

Polybii hist. quæ supersunt: ad fid. opt. libr. T. ii.—iv. 12mo. *Lipsiæ*, 1816.

Ramus, C. Catalogus numorum vet. Græcorum et Romanorum musei Regis Daniæ. Disposuit descrips. et æneis tabb. illustrav. iii. vol. 4to. maj. *Havniæ*, 1816.

Reisig, C. conjectaneorum in Aristophanem libri ii. ad G. Hermannum, lib. i. 8vo. *Lipsiæ*, 1816.

Richter, J. A. L. Phantasien des Alterthums oder Sammlung der mytholog. Sagen der Hellener, Römer, u. Ægypter. u. s. w. 8vo. *Leipzig*, 1816.

Rosenmüller, E. F. C. Scholia in vet. Testament. P. vii. vol. iv. 8vo. *Lipsiæ*, 1816.

Sallustius, C. Catilina, oder buch von Catilina's Verschwörung gegen Rom's Freiheit. Uebers. von G. F. W. Grosse. 8vo. *Halle*, 1816.

Seidenstücker, Dr. J. H. P. Anfangsgründe zur erlernung der griech. Sprache. 1ste. Abtheil. 8vo. *Dortmund*, 1816.

Stäudlin, Dr. C. F. und Dr. H. G. Tzschirner, Archiv. für alte und neue Kirchengeschichte. 3n. bds. 2s. Stück. 8vo. *Leipzig*, 1816.

Stollberg, F. L. Graf zu, Geschichte der Religion Jesu Christi 12r. bd. 8vo. *Hamburg*, 1816.

Testamentum nov. Græcum, perpetua annotatione illustratum. Edit. Koppianæ, vol. ix. 8vo. *Göttingen*, 1816.

Tibullus, A. mit deutscher Uebersetzung u. e. Auswahl. d. vorzüglichsten prüfenden Anmerkungen. 4to. *Leipzig*, 1816.

Vater, J. S. Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache. 1r. Kurs. 8vo. *Leipzig*, 1816.

Versuch einer gebundenen Uebersetzung einiger Pindarischen Olympischen u. pythischen Hymnen m. Anmerkungen. 3te. Abtheil. 8vo. *Leipzig*, 1816.

Virgilii P. M. Opera in tironum gratiam perpet. annotatione

illustrat. a C. G. Heynio. Ed. 4ta. ed. E. C. F. Wunderlich, et post ejus mortem F. E. Ruhkopf. vol. ii. 8vo. *Lipsiæ*, 1816.

Wolf, F. A. literarische Analekten vorzüglich für alte Literatur u. Kunst. 8vo. *Berlin*, 1816.

Xenophon, Anabasis von J. M. Hobzmann. 8vo *Carlsruhe*, 1816.

That indefatigable French scholar, M. GAIL, has lately published an interesting little work, which bears the following title:

Trois Odes d'Anacréon traduites en Vers Français, et mises en Musique avec accompagnement de Piano ou Harpe, par M. Le Sueur; prix 4 fr. Les mêmes réunies à 6 autres Odes accompagnées d'une Version Latine, 8 fr. Et avec le Portrait d'Anacréon, gravé par Gaucher, 10 fr.

Acta Philologorum Monacensium edidit Frid. THIERSCH. Tom. ii. fascic. 3. Monachii 1817. 8vo.

This number contains Franc. Goeller's *Observationes in Thucydidem*; and Doederlein's *Emendationes et Observationes in Taciti Agricolam*; Siebelis' *de formulis* χρῆσθαι ὑμῷ *et* χρῆσθαι τῷ ὑμῷ *apud Pausaniam*; Thiersch's *de epitaphio in Atheniensis qui in pugna ad Potidæam ceciderunt*. [See *Class. Journal*, Numb. xxvii. p. 185, 186.] F. Jacobs' *Notæ criticæ in Libanii Apologiam Socratis*.

A Primavera. Idyllio traduzido do Grego em Portuguez; por J. B. A. S. Lisboa. 1816. pag. 7.

We are indebted to M. Barbosa for this elegant version of Meleager's elegant Idyllium.

Geógraphie de Strabon traduite du Grec en François. T. iv. Paris Imprimerie Royale. in 4to. 1ere partie pag. xvi. + 339. 11e. partie pp. xvi + 406.

This volume contains Strabo's x—xiv books. The xth and xith books were translated by the late M. De la Porte du Theil; the rest by Dr. Coray.

Φίλωνος τοῦ Ἰουδαίου περὶ ἀρετῆς καὶ τῶν ταύτης μορίων: Philonis Judæi de Virtute ejusque partibus. Invenit et interpretatus est Angelus Maius. Præponitur Dissertatio cum descriptione librorum aliquot incognitorum Philonis, eumque partibus nonnullis Chronici inediti Eusebii Pamphili, et aliorum operum notitia e codd. Armeniacis petita Mediol. 1816. 8vo. pagg. lxxx + 28.

Dissertation sur l'ancienne copie de la *Cène* de Leonard de Vinci,

qu'on voit maintenant au Musée Royal; comparée à la plus célèbre de toutes, celle des Chartreux de Pavie, et à la copie récente d'après laquelle s'exécute à Milan une mosaïque egale en dimensions à l'original. Par Aimé Guillon: &c. Paris 1817. 8vo. pag. 51.

Πορφυρίου φιλοσόφου πρὸς Μαρκέλλαν. Porphyrii Philosophi ad Marcellam. Invenit, interpretatione notisque declaravit Angelus Maius. Accedit ejusdem Porphyrii poeticum fragmentum. [et Scholium Græcum ad *Βασιλικῶν* libr. 45. tit. 6.] Mediol. 1816. 8vo. pag. viii + 68.

ΑΡΙΣΤΟΦΑΝΟΥΣ ΠΛΟΥΤΟΣ. Plutus, Comédie d'Aristophane avec un choix de Scholies et des notes françaises, pour les classes, &c. par A. T. Du Casau, D. LL. professeur au college de Poitiers, &c. Paris. in 12o. pag. viii + 200.

The second volume of Strabo, edited by the learned Dr. Coray, has recently made its appearance.

G. T. Christiani Reuvens Oratio de Literarum disciplina animos ad studia severiora et ad vitam communem præparante; habita a. d. 25. jan. a. 1816: Cum Literarum Gr. Lat. et Histor. professionem in Athenæo Harderovicensi auspicaretur. Harderov. 1816. in 8vo. pag. 31.

Redevoring over de Verdienssen der Amsterdammers, ten aanzien van der opbouw en de Volmaking der Neder Duitsche taal en Letter kunde, door jo. P. Van Cappellen, &c. &c. Amsterd. 1816. in 4to. pag. 75.

Il Sogno di Scipione, Voltato in Greco per Massimo Planude, e fatto volgare per M. Zanobi da Strata coronato poeta Florentino. Pisa 1816. 8vo. pagg. viii + 57. The editor is the celebrated professor Ciampi of Pisa.

Volgarizzamento d'alcuni Squarci di Sallustio, contenuti nel medessimo codice del Sogno di Scipione, e forse da attribuirsi anche questo a M. Zanobi da Strata. pag. 8.—with this advertisement Di questo Volgarizzamento sono stati tirati solo 30 esemplari.

Συλλογὴ 'Ελληνικῶν 'Ανεκδότων ποιητῶν καὶ λογογράφων διαφόρων ἐποχῶν 'Ελλάδος, σπουδῇ 'Α. Μουστοξύδου καὶ Δημ. Σχινᾶ. Τετράδια γ' καὶ δ'.

These two numbers contain: *'Ανώνυμος βίος 'Ισοκράτους καὶ ὑπο-*

θεσις εἰς τὸν πρὸς Δημόνικον λόγον; Γεμιστίου Πλήθωνος μοναδία ἐπὶ τῇ ἀοιδίμῳ δεσποίνῃ Ὑπομενῇ; Θεοφίλου περὶ κατασκευῆς ἀνθρώπου ἀποσπάσματα; τοῦ αὐτοῦ περὶ διαχωρημάτων; Ὀλυμπιοδώρου σχόλια εἰς τὸν Πλάτωνα.

Περὶ τῶν τεσσάρων ἵππων τῆς ἐν Βενετίᾳ Βασιλικῆς τοῦ Ἁγίου Μάρκου, Ἐπιστολὴ τοῦ ἐκ Κερκύρας Ἀ. Μουστοξύδου, μεταφρασθεῖσα ἐκ τῆς Ἰταλικῆς παρὰ Γ. Ἀσάνη. Ἐν Βενετ. 1816. pag. 8+44.

The book περὶ ἀρετῆς, which il Signor Mai has printed with the name of Philo, and has not yet edited, has had already many editions with the genuine name of Gemistus Pletho.

Annales Encyclopédiques, rédigées par A. L. Millin, Cheva lier de l'Ordre royal de la Légion-d'Honneur, Conservateur du Cabinet des Médailles, des pierres gravées, et des antiques de la Bibliothèque du Roi, membre de l'Institut royal de France dans l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, etc.

Prospectus. Il y a vingt-deux ans que M. Millin a commencé le *Magasin Encyclopédique.* Ce Journal a été favorablement accueilli dans l'Europe; mais la collection en est devenue très-nombreuse; elle forme cent vingt-deux volumes: la difficulté de la compléter, empêche souvent d'en acquérir la suite. C'est ce qui a engagé son auteur a terminer ce Journal à l'année 1816, et à publier un autre recueil qui, sans cesser de pouvoir faire suite à celui-ci, en fût indépendant.

Chaque numéro des *Annales Encyclopédiques* sera, comme l'étoit le *Magasin,* divisé en trois parties.

La *première* contiendra des Mémoires originaux ou traduits des langues étrangères sur les sciences historiques, la littérature et les arts; des biographies, des pièces inédites, etc.

La *seconde* annoncera les événemens littéraires de tous les pays, les découvertes importantes dans les sciences et dans les arts, les inventions utiles, les expositions de tableaux ou d'objets d'art, les érections de monumens, les produits des fouilles, et enfin les travaux des académies, la mort des savans et des artistes, etc.

La *troisième* partie renfermera des notices des ouvrages les plus importans, et une simple indication des autres, et le tout présentera, autant qu'il est possible, l'histoire littéraire de chaque année dans toute l'Europe. Les objets qu'il est nécessaire d'offrir aux yeux, pour les bien faire comprendre à l'esprit, seront gravés.

L'auteur espère que les savans, les artistes, les gens de lettres francais et étrangers avec lesquels il est en correspondance, voudront bien la lui continuer, et contribuer encore à donner à cette entreprise l'utilité, l'agrément et l'intérêt qu'elle peut offrir.

A compter du 15 janvier 1817, il paroîtra, chaque mois, un numéro de ce Journal. Chaque numéro aura douze à treize feuilles d'impression; celles de la première partie en cicéro, celles des deux autres en petit-romain et en petit-texte. Chaque numéro sera accompagné d'une gravure, et ce nombre sera augmenté si cela est nécessaire.

Le prix de la souscription est de 36 fr. pour Paris, et de 42 fr. francs de port dans les départemens. On ne pourra souscrire pour moins de six mois.

Le bureau des *Annales Encyclopédiques* est rue Neuve des Petits-Champs, no. 12. C'est là qu'il faut adresser, francs de port, les lettres, l'argent, ce qu'on désire faire annoncer dans ce Journal, ou faire parvenir au rédacteur.

Junii Antonii comitis de Restiis Patricii Ragusini Carmina. Patavii. 1816. 8vo. pagg. xxxii + 264.

Mémoire sur la valeur des monnoies de Compte chez les Peuples de l'Antiquité; Par M. le Cte. Germain Garnier; Associé libre de l'Académie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, &c. Paris 1817. 4to. pagg. 91.

De constanti et æquabili J. Christi indole, doctrina ac docendi ratione, sive Commentationes de Evangelio Joannis cum Matthæi, Marci et Lucæ Evangeliis comparato. Scripsit E. A. Borger. Pars I. Lugd. Batav. 1816. 8vo. pagg. xvi + 180.

H. Arentii Hamaker Lectiones Philostrateæ. Fascic. 1us continens observationes in iv. Libros priores et excursum in libr. iv. de Vita Apollonii. Lugd. Batav. 1816. pagg. viii + 134.

L'Orestéïde ou description de deux bas-reliefs du palais Grimani à Venise; et de quelques monuments qui ont rapport à l'histoire d'Oreste, par M. Millin. Paris. 1817. 4to. pag. 24.

Discours historique sur l'origine de la Pologne, sur la langue et la poësie Polonaise, sur l'idiome et les dialectes Slaviniques, ainsi que sur la géographie ancienne du nord (par M. Orchowsky, conseiller Varsovie.) 8vo. pagg. 357.

Recueil de monumens antiques, la plupart inédits et découverts dans l'ancienne Gaule, ouvrage enrichi de cartes et planches en taille douce etc. par Grivaud de la Vincelle. 2. vol. in 4to et un vol. de planches. Paris. 1817.

Dionysii Halicarnassei Romanorum antiquitatum pars hactenus desiderata; nunc denique ope Cod. Ambrosianorum ab Angelo Majo quantum licuit restituta. 188. pp. 4to. Milan. 1816.

Tragœdiæ Græcæ Primordia et progressus: auctore C. Pfaff 38. pp. 4to. 1815.

Isocratis oratio de permutatione, cujus pars ingens primum Græce edita ab A. Mustoxide, nunc primum Latine exhibetur ab anonymo interprete, qui et notas et appendices adjunxit. 8vo. Milan. 1816.

The following were published, at Leipsic, on the plan of the Elzevirs, in 18mo. in 1816.

(1.) Thucyd. Opera. 2 vols.
(2.) Polybii Hist. quæ supersunt. 4 vols.
(3.) Herodoti Hal. Hist. ix. 3 vols.
(4.) Hesiodi Carm. 1 vol.
(5.) Ciceronis Op. Tomus 4tus 1 vol.

J. V. Franckii Callinus sive quæstionis de origine carminis elegiaci tractatio critica. Accedunt Tyrtæi reliquiæ cum procemio et critica annotatione. 200 pp. 8vo. Altona. 1816.

M. A. Plauti fragm. ined., item ad Publ. Terent. comment. et picturæ ined., inventore Angelo Mayo. 66. pp. 8vo. Milan. 1815.

De Accusativo cum infinitivo disputatio, auctore G. Wachsmuth. 42. pp. 4to. Halle. 1815.

Emendationes Livianas scripsit C. L. Walch. 8vo. Berlin. 1816.

Jamblichi Chalcidensis, ex Cœlosyria de vita Pythagorica liber. Græce et Latine. Textum post L. Kusterum ad fidem codd. MSS. recognovit, Ulrici Obrechti interpretationem Latinam passim mutavit, Kusteri aliorumque animadvv. adjecit suas M. Theod. Kiessling. Accedunt præter Porphyrium de vita Pythagoræ cum notis Lucæ Holstenii et Cunr. Rittershusii, itemque anonymum apud Photium de vita Pythagoræ, variæ lectiones in Jamblichi lib. tert. et quart. e cod. Cizensi enotatæ. Pars posterior. 331. pp. 8vo. Leipsic. 1816.

Memoirs of the popular assemblies of the ancient Romans; by C. F. Schulz, 372 pp. 8vo. Gothia 1816. In the first section the author treats in many chapters of the Romans, and of their primitive constitution; of the division of the people into curiæ, tribes, and centuries; and the power of the people, &c. The second section is on the assemblies of the people in general, and the third on particular assemblies.

Babrii fabb. choliamb. Lib. III. Accedit Lib. quartus fabb. et narrationum poeticarum ex Anthologia Græca aliisque auctoribus excerptus. Collegit Babrii imprimis fabb. numeris et integritati pristinæ pro iis, quæ modo, exstant, copiis restituit, versionemque horum omnium metricam lingua German. subjunxit Franc. Xaver. Berger 176 pp. 8vo. Munich. 1816.

Poetica ex Aristotelis nova versio, cum textu Gr. haud paucis in locis emendato, auctore de Haus. 8vo. Palermo, 1815.

Pindari carmina Gr. et Lat. translat. carm. et illustrata a L. Costa. 3 vol. 4to. Padua, 1808.

Porphyri Philosophi ad Marcellam; invenit, interpretatione notisque illustravit Angelus Majus. Accedit ejusdem poeticum fragmentum. 66 pp. 8vo.

Tacitus, C. C. de situ, moribus et populis Germanorum, exposuit J. C. Dithmarus; accedunt in appendice notæ Conringii, Lacarrii, et Leibnitii, cum excerptis notis Jac. Gronovii, vol. 8vo. Leipsic.

Aristoteles, &c. The natural history of animals, by Aristotle, translated from the Greek into Dutch, and accompanied with observations and notes, by Dr. F. Strak. 8vo. Frankfort, 1816.

A new critique of the Classical Roman poets, containing observations on Ovid, Virgil, and Tibullus, by C. C. Sprengel, 142 pp. 8vo. Berlin, 1815.

Memoir on the ancient comic theatre of Athens, by P. F. Kaungieser, 8vo. Breslau, 1816.

Herodiani de imperio post Marcum Historiarum Lib. 8. cum animadvv. edidit D. G. E. Weber, 8vo. Leipsic 1816.

Novum in Platonis Timæum et Christiani conjecturar. specimen, auctore O. F. Lindau. 8vo. Breslau 1816.

Platonis Dial. delectus. Pars 1ma ex recensione et cum Lat. interpret. Fr. Aug. Wolfii. 140 pp. 8vo. Berlin, 1812.

Platonis Dialogi, Gr. et. Lat. Ex recensione Immanuelis Bekkeri.

Platonis Dialogi IV. Meno, Crito, Alcibiades uterque, cum VV. DD. animadvv. curaverunt J. E. Biester et Ph. Buttmannus. Editio 3. pp. 243. 8vo. Berlin, 1811.

Platonis Doctrina de Deo de dialogis ejus excerpta et in ordinem redacta auctore Ludovico Horstel. 192 pp. 8vo. Leipsic 1814.

De Diis Laribus disseruit et edidit T. Hempelius, 63 pp. 8vo. Zwickan 1816.

Conjugations, System, &c. The system of the conjugations of Sancrit compared with that of the Greek language, by F. Bapp, published by C. J. Windischmann. 312 pp. 8vo. Frankfort, 1816.

Tableau historique de l'état des progrès de la littérature française

depuis 1789, par Marie Joseph Chenier. Un vol. in 8. Deuxième édition. Maradan.

Notice sur les Benjaminites rétablis en Israël : poëme traduit de l'hébreu par M. De Malleville, conseiller en la cour royale de Paris, membre de l'académie des antiquaires de France, par Michel Berr, membre résident de l'académie royale des sciences, lettres, arts et agriculture de Nanci (extrait du Mercure étranger, No. 21, 1816.) Broch. in 8. Egron.

Méthode pour étudier la langue grecque, par M. Bournouf, professeur au college royal de France, etc. Quatrième édition revue, corrigée et augmentée d'une table. Un vol. in 8. Delalain.

Messrs. TREUTTEL and WURTZ publish at their houses in Paris, Strasbourg, and London, two monthly periodical Bibliographical works :

1. Journal Général de la Littérature Française,
2. Journal Général de la Littérature Etrangère. Price, in Paris, 15 fr. each, for the year.

The second volume of the *Translation* of *Pausanias*, by the learned M. CLAVIER, is published. We have not yet received it ; but we understand that the critical notes are deferred to the end of the work.

M. CLAVIER's translation of the *Bibliotheca* of *Apollodorus*, with the text, in 2 vols. 8vo. has not been so much noticed in this country as it deserves. We will take this opportunity of vindicating the author from misinterpretation. It is observed in the *Quarterly Review*, No. IX. that, as a reward for his labors in classical literature, he was appointed judge in a court of criminal justice in Paris. " It is undoubtedly," says the critic, " an evil omen for the liberties of a country, when the great trusts of office are placed in the hands of the *mandarins of science*, or when the administration of justice is confided to jurisconsults, because they are learned in the law of Crete, and familiarly conversant with the precedents of the judgment of Paris and the trial of Mars." Review of Clavier's *Histoire des premiers tems de la Grèce*.

This is true in the general principle, and not improbable from the nature of the government of France in 1809 ; but it is not true in fact. M. Clavier was destined from his youth for the bar and the magistracy, and he was in practice before the revolution. In the midst of the most difficult and turbulent times he maintained his integrity, and never sacrificed his public duty to his private interest. He lost his situation in 1810, as might naturally be expected from his character ; but he received his consolation from

the love and veneration of his country, proofs of which are found in many documents. Some time after he was elected professor of history in the college of France, a situation which has afforded him more leisure to range over the fields of classical literature.

Grammaire Romane, ou Grammaire de la langue des Troubadours; par M. Raynouard, membre de l'Institut Royal de France, Paris 1816. 8vo. pp. 351.

Elements de la *Grammaire* de la langue *Romane* avant l'an 1000, précédés de recherches sur l'origine et la formation de cette langue; par le même. 1816. 8vo. pp. iv.+105.

Recherches sur *l'ancienneté* de la langue *Romane*, par le même. Paris 1816. 8vo. pp. 31.

Serments prêtés à Strasbourg en 842, par Charles le Chauve et Louis le Germanique; traduits en François avec des notes &c. par M. de Mourcin. Paris 1815. 8vo. pp. xiv+85.

Virgilii Culex: le Moucheron traduit en vers françois; enrichi du texte Latin de Bembo et de son dialogue à H. Strozzi; suivi des imitations de Parmindo, Spencer et Voss, des commentaires de Scaliger, Burmann et Heyne, etc. etc. par M. le Cte. de Valori. Paris 1817. in 18mo. pp. 288.

BIBLICAL INTELLIGENCE.

Arnob. Afri disputationem adversus gentes, Lib. 7. recognovit notis prior. Interpret. select. aliosque et suis illustravit J. C. Orellius 8vo. Leipsic, 1816.

The New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ, translated into Polonese from the Vulgate, by James Wujek, of Wogrowietz. A new re-impression made at the expense of the Russian Bible Society 8vo. Warsaw and Petersburg, 1816. This New Testament is taken from the Polonese translation of the Bible, published in 1599, by Father Wujek, and approved by Pope Clement VII. The Russian Bible Society has printed 5000 copies, and has raised an expectation of a re-impression of the complete Bible of Wujek, which will appear either at Warsaw or at Petersburg. The ancient editions of this translation of the Bible in Polonese are very rare, and are sold for nearly 15 roubles.

ANTIQUITIES.

Elements of Archæology, or of the knowledge of the history of the art of the ancients, and of the monuments and works of the art of Classical antiquity, by C. D. Beck. 250 pp. 8vo. Leipsic 1816.

NOTES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Corrections of the Common Translation of St. John, in our next.

Observations on the Iambic Metre of Phædrus, in our next.

Vindiciæ Antiquæ is unavoidably postponed.

The Cambridge Prizes were adjudged too late, to be given in the present Number.

We have received a variety of articles, to which we shall pay a due attention.

We must again request our correspondents to write a clear, legible hand.

[*Advertisements.*]

Recently Imported by PAYNE and FOSS, 88, Pall Mall,

LYCOPHRONIS CASSANDRA,

Gr. et Lat. cum Commentario JOHANNIS TZETZÆ, studio LEOPOLDI SEBASTIANI. Romæ 1803. in quarto, price 1*l.* 16*s.* sewed.

Just published, in 3 Vols. price 2*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.* boards,

THE GREEK TESTAMENT;

A new Edition—Containing copious Notes from HARDY, RAPHEL, KYPKE, SCHLEUSNER, ROSENMULLER, &c. in familiar Latin: together with parallel Passages from the Classics, and with references to Vigerus for Idioms, and Bos for Ellipses. OCTAVO EDITION, being the only one edited by the Rev. E. VALPY, B. D. Master of Norwich School; and Chaplain to the BISHOP of NORWICH.—*** This Work is chiefly intended for the use of the Student in Divinity.—A few copies, large paper, price 4*l.* Printed by A. J. Valpy, and sold by Longman & Co. Baldwin & Co. and all other Booksellers.

Also, by the same,

ELEGANTIÆ LATINÆ,

Or, Rules and Exercises illustrative of elegant Latin Style. Price 4*s.* 6*d.* fifth Edition.

JAN 2 8 1966

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY